THE TEACHING OF CHRIST

EDWARD GORDON SELWYN

Marked throughout

Indexed

(59)

32 Beg. of Xian Ch (see Lake p. 23

56 Father NRE

65 Faith -

77 not of 13 - XXX see Lake p 28

84 Interimostlink - see Lake p 34

93 Non-resistance

145 Son of man - see Lake

THE LAYMAN'S LIBRARY

Edited by F. C. BURKITT, M.A., F.B.A.,
Norrisian Professor of Divinity in the University of Cambridge,

and the Rev. G. E. NEWSOM, M.A.,
Professor of Pastoral Theology in King's College, London, Reader at the Temple Church.

THE TEACHING OF CHRIST

THE LAYMAN'S LIBRARY

Edited by F. C. BURKITT, M.A., F.B.A., Norrisian Professor of Divinity in the University of Cambridge, and Rev. G. E. NEWSOM, M.A., Professor of Pastoral Theology in King's College, London, Reader at the Temple Church.

Crown 8vo. 2s. 6d. net each Volume.

THE FAITH OF THE OLD TESTAMENT. By the Rev. ALEXANDER NAIRNE, M.A., B.D., Professor of Hebrew and Exegesis of the Old Testament at King's College, London. With a Preface by F. C. BURKITT, M.A., F.B.A., Norrisian Professor of Divinity in the University of Cambridge.

WHAT IS THE GOSPEL? OR REDEMPTION. A Study in the Doctrine of Atonement. By the Rev. J. G. SIMPSON, D.D., Canon and Precentor of St. Paul's.

SOME ALTERNATIVES TO JESUS CHRIST. A Comparative Study of Faiths in Divine Incarnation. By JOHN LESLIE JOHNSTON, M.A., Fellow and Dean of Arts, Magdalen College, late Lecturer in Theology at New College, Oxford.

THE TEACHING OF CHRIST. An Attempt to Appreciate the Main Lineaments of the Teaching of Christ in their Historical Proportion. By the Rev. EDWARD GORDON SELWYN, M.A., Warden of Radley, formerly Fellow of Corpus Christi College, Cambridge, and Examining Chaplain to the Bishop of London.

DISCOVERY AND REVELATION. By the Rev. HAROLD FRANCIS HAMILTON, D.D., Professor of Pastoral Theology, Bishop's College, Lennoxville, Canada, 1907-10.

PRINCIPLES OF CHURCHMANSHIP. By the Rev. G. E. NEWSOM, M.A., Professor of Pastoral Theology in King's College, London, Reader at the Temple Church.

CHURCH AND STATE. An Historical Sketch of the Church of England in its Relations with the State. By DOUGLAS EYRE, B.A., Barrister-at-Law.

THE PROBLEM OF EVIL. By the Rev. PETER GREEN, M.A., Canon of Manchester.

THE CHURCH IN HISTORY. A Study of its Continuity, Development, and Influence. By the Rev. ERIC MILNER-WHITE, M.A., Chaplain of King's College, Cambridge, Examining Chaplain to the Bishop of London.

THE HOLY SPIRIT. By the Rev. A. E. J. RAWLINSON, M.A., Lecturer in Theology and Classics at Christ Church, Oxford, Examining Chaplain to the Bishop of Lichfield; formerly Tutor of Keble College.

Other Volumes are in Preparation and in Contemplation.

LONGMANS, GREEN, AND CO.
LONDON, NEW YORK, BOMBAY, AND CALCUTTA

Gospels

THE TEACHING OF CHRIST

An Attempt to Appreciate the Main Lineaments of the Teaching of Christ in their Historical Proportion

BY THE REV.

EDWARD GORDON SELWYN, M.A.

WARDEN OF RADLEY,
FORMERLY FELLOW OF CORPUS CHRISTI COLLEGE, CAMBRIDGE,
AND EXAMINING CHAPLAIN TO THE BISHOP OF LONDON

Marked throughout

LONGMANS, GREEN AND CO.
39 PATERNOSTER ROW, LONDON
FOURTH AVENUE & 30TH STREET, NEW YORK
BOMBAY, CALCUTTA, AND MADRAS
1915

CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION

ALTHOUGH this book has suffered in its latter stages from the constant pressure of other duties, and in all its stages from an ignorance on several material subjects which the writer has never been able to overhaul, yet the ambition to write it and the lines which it should follow were conceived some seven or eight years ago. About that time I read two books in quick succession, both of them, after their kind, manifestoes—namely, Harnack's *What is Christianity?* and Tyrrell's *Christianity at the Cross-Roads*. The first of these left one with the feeling that, if that were Christianity, it was too dull and too ordinary a thing to be worth much trouble. If that were really what Christ had preached, then He was likely enough no more than the man, Jesus, whom Liberal Theology made Him out to be. Yet it was hard to see, if so, how any one should ever have thought of Christianity as likely to 'turn the world upside down'; how any sinner could have found in it deliverance from his sins; or any saint made it the moving power of his or her sanctification. There seemed a disparity here between cause and effect which was perplexing.

Then came Schweitzer and his interpreter, Tyrrell. *The Quest of the Historical Jesus* was a boon, if only because it exploded the myth of the Jesus of Liberalism. It did at least give us as historical One who was 'a stranger to our time.' That was hopeful, if only because, had He been native to our time, with its staring

limitations and superficialities, He could hardly have been, or be in future, the lord and heir of all generations. In that He was 'a stranger and enigma,' He was absorbingly interesting. Men are always aroused by a stranger at the door, by some one from a foreign land, by a personality which puzzles; and if at the same time he appeals to all that is highest in them, they are soon on the high road to worship. Thus, when Tyrrell claimed that just because of this otherworldliness the Christ of Eschatology was the Christ of the Catholic Church, he seemed to have gone a long way towards re-establishing faith.

Yet Tyrrell's book is open to certain very obvious criticisms. In the first place, he had swallowed Schweitzer whole. Only three years elapsed between the publication of *Von Reimarus zu Wrede* and that of *Christianity at the Cross-Roads*; and in that short period it was impossible for the permanent worth of Schweitzer's book to have been appraised in its due proportions. What Schweitzer did was to show that Jesus, if anything historical could be predicated of Him at all, was from the beginning a figure clothed in dogma—not indeed the dogma of the Nicene or any other Christian age, but the dogma of Jewish eschatological expectation—and that the key to His ministry lay there. From the primary significance of eschatology for the interpretation of the teaching of Christ there seems no intention among English theologians to recede; and no further justification is needed for having taken that hypothesis as the basis of this book.

But, be it noted, it is only an hypothesis. That is to say, it needs verification, and this book is the result of the attempt to find out how it works. In two very material points Tyrrell's adaptation of the hypothesis

was unsatisfactory. He left no adequate room for the growth and play of the ethical life. If his picture of Christ were historical, Christian civilisation would be a contradiction in terms; the two things—Christianity and civilisation—could not co-exist except on a basis of armed neutrality. How then are we to explain the immense impetus which the Christian motive has in point of fact, especially in Protestant countries, given to efforts after social regeneration? For this manward directed moral endeavour Tyrrell substitutes a radical pessimism—tinged, it is true, by an ultimate optimism and the hope of another world, but taking no real account of the genuine enrichment of this world's life which Christianity has certainly wrought. Here was a gap which needed filling in, and I have tried to do this, partly by attempting to get at the spirit which underlies the moral teaching of the historical Jesus, and partly in another way.

One of the presuppositions of a strong moral life is the importance of Time; for events happen in Time, and have consequences in Time—consequences which, for a religion which sets store by human happiness, give to moral action half its seriousness. Thus, Christianity is a religion uniquely adapted to moral redemption, because it rests upon historical facts belonging to the assumption by God of the conditions of Time; and any interpretation of the Creed which reads it as myth instead of history takes away its power to transform men's lives here and now. Into a danger not far removed from this we should be led, if we accepted Tyrrell's interpretation of Christ's teaching. For he makes the time-category in the words of Jesus merely a symbol. Futurity, he says, is Christ's way of expressing transcendence: when He

said that the kingdom of God should come immediately, He meant that it was transcendental in character. The problem presented by Christ's predictions of the Kingdom is difficult enough; but it is surely not to be solved by attributing to our Lord an attitude towards Time which our own moral experience repudiates. For practical, as apart from metaphysical, purposes, Time and the Future are real, and not symbolic; and some explanation of Christ's teaching must be given which satisfies on that score.

This task I have attempted in the sixth chapter. I do not pretend to be satisfied. It is open to the criticism of being too much of a 'harmony'; but then it purports to be that, or at least to show up the links in the chain of transition from the religion of Jesus to that of the Apostolic age. And it leaves plenty of frayed edges. That is no doubt necessary, where the evidence at our disposal is so fragmentary; but it is none the less unsatisfactory. Still it may offer some slight contribution towards the solution of a problem which is likely to occupy students and thinking men for a considerable time.

The method of this book is simple. In the first five chapters I have taken the teaching of Christ as recorded in the Synoptic Gospels as it stands, and tried to show what it meant for Him and for those who heard Him. I have followed the Synoptic record, because I did not wish to trench upon the vexed question of the authenticity of the Fourth Gospel. This does not mean that I regard the Fourth Gospel as an unreliable source for our Lord's teaching. Indeed, I become more and more convinced that we shall never know the truth about our Lord until we have learned to give to St. John's Gospel

its proper worth as an historical document. But there are obvious advantages in using the Fourth Gospel in such a book as this to illustrate rather than to prove: and it never ceases to affect the reckoning, even though it is on the outskirts of the field of *data*. As to the Synoptic record itself, I have tried to use only such evidence for our Lord's teaching as would be generally acceptable in circles of English scholarship; and where I have taken a stand on ground reputed to be treacherous, I have done so, in most cases, I hope, knowingly.

The sixth and seventh chapters are rather different in character. The former aims at showing how the teaching of Jesus was translated into the language of the Apostolic age, and integrated into the experience of the communities taught by St. Paul and St. John. The latter is an attempt to show what principles our Lord left to His Church for its further progress. For the translation of His teaching has still to go on, so far at least as concerns its primary dogmatic side. Expressed as it was bound to be in the thought-forms available to our Lord, it needs as each age passes to be restated and reinterpreted. I do not feel competent to attempt that restatement myself in any comprehensive way, and have contented myself in the earlier chapters with pointing out what seemed to be the bearing of this or that element of Christ's teaching on our own day; while the last chapter is a kind of prolegomena to the more systematic restatement which is daily becoming more urgently required. If the civilisation of the world is ever to regain any stability, it will only be because it has agreed at large to accept certain ideas. How long must we wait for another 'City of God'?

Finally, let me close this Introduction with a few

words of thanks where thanks are due. First of all, I must express my gratitude to my father, who, though he is not responsible for any of the conclusions in this book, yet made the writing of it possible owing to the interest in Theology which he stimulated in me ever since I was a boy. Further, I have to thank him for compiling the index. Secondly, I owe a peculiar debt to Professor Burkitt, who has gone far beyond his duties as editor of this series in the kindness with which he has always considered and criticised any suggestions I had to make. Thirdly, I should like to say how grateful I am to the members of the Bible Study Week for Teachers, who in 1913 allowed me to give them the substance of this book as lectures at Claydon, beneath the hospitable roof of Sir Harry Verney and Lady Rachel, his wife. Not only was their sympathy encouraging; but I was enabled to clear my own mind on several points. And, lastly, I cannot forbear to mention a group of Cambridge friends, in contact with whom many of the leading ideas in this book were hammered out. One cannot have lived near Father Waggett for three years without learning from him perpetually; while my friendship with Mr. W. Spens, Fellow and Tutor of Corpus Christi College, and with Mr. H. L. Pass, Warden of St. Anselm's House, has been of the utmost value in every way. These expressions of gratitude must suffice to cover a host of other debts which are too numerous to mention.

Note.—At the end of the book will be found a short index, and also a list of notes and references classified under the pages to which they belong. This has seemed more satisfactory than adorning the pages of the text itself with footnotes.

CHAPTER I

THE VISION OF THE KINGDOM

THE Kingdom of God forms the central feature of the teaching of Christ. Alike in His public and His private discourses, it is this which He holds before men as the goal of His life and of theirs. It bulks larger even than His teaching about the Father, about Himself, and about men and their duties. For it includes all these. It is the Father whose Kingdom is to be realised, so that in it He comes at last into His own, and receives the worship due to Him from His sons : it is the Son of Man Himself who will inaugurate His Kingdom, admit men into it or reject them, and govern it as God's vicegerent ; it is for the Kingdom that men must now prepare themselves, by repentance, prayer, and good deeds, if they would be numbered among the redeemed who dwell there. Each of these elements in the whole raises problems peculiar to itself ; each is vital and fundamental. But they are embraced historically under the larger whole of the conception of the Kingdom of God ; and it is only when subsumed under this wider conception that they admit of balanced theological treatment, and that their difficulties find adequate adjustment. They are jewels set in a ring, not isolated and separable gems ; and we shall do well to look at the ring itself before examining the stones which cause its splendour.

The phrase 'the Kingdom of God' or 'the Kingdom of Heaven' was not a novel one to those who listened to Jesus. There is some doubt as to which of the two phrases He actually used, if indeed He did not use both. The First Gospel usually, though not invariably, employs the latter form; for 'Heaven' was largely current among the Jews as a means of avoiding the mention of the Divine Name. Certain scholars have tried to show that the two terms occur in two different contexts, and suggest two distinct associations of thought; as, for instance, that the one refers to an eschatological, the other to an inward and spiritual Kingdom. But it is questionable how far this divergence of reference can be made out. And in any case, all admit that the general meaning of the two phrases is the same. They mean the rule or sovereignty of God, or the sphere in which that rule is exercised. The Aramaic scholar, Dalman, has shown that the word translated into the Greek equivalent of 'kingdom' means properly 'rule'; but a number of passages show that it must have been extended to cover the sphere in which such rule found sway. So much is involved in what is said of 'entering' the Kingdom, of the Kingdom 'suffering violence,' or of a Kingdom being divided against itself. The two meanings pass into one another at every point, and nothing is gained by refining upon the translations of the word used by Jesus in our Greek and English Bibles.

For the Jews had for centuries looked forward to a time and a condition of things in which the sovereignty of God should find unhindered exercise. The burden of much of the teaching of the prophets had been the imminence of the Day of the Lord, when His enemies should be crushed. They were all men of emergencies.

The situations with which they had to deal were marked either by religious and moral corruption within Israel, or by Israel's humiliation at the hands of foreign peoples. In such circumstances they brought a message of hope. God had not forsaken His covenant with His chosen, but would speedily vindicate His honour and establish His rule upon earth. This expectation of a good time coming, conceived of usually as a restoration of that Davidic Kingdom of which the memory was a perpetual joy to Israel, runs through all the prophetic writings of the Old Testament. But the details of the picture vary widely. Isaiah and Jeremiah speak of a Messiah of David's line who shall govern His Kingdom for God; Haggai seems to regard Zerubbabel as shortly to be invested with this Messianic office; but with the rest of the prophets it is God Himself who will inaugurate the new order and rule in it. All foretell a Judgment before the Kingdom comes. But while Amos, Hosea, Micah, and Malachi regard Israel itself as involved for its sins in this 'Day of Jehovah,' as it is called, Habakkuk and Nahum, Zechariah and Joel confine this Judgment and its terrors to the heathen nations alone. Again, the prophets differ as to those who shall have part in the new Divine order. Ezekiel and certain fragments of Isaiah, for instance, exclude the Gentiles altogether; Micah, Jeremiah, and other portions of Isaiah admit such of the nations as are converted or have not oppressed Israel; Zephaniah and Ezekiel expect a sifting of Israel itself, whereby only the righteous shall be counted worthy of the Kingdom; while the climax of ethical universalism is reached by the writer of Deutero-Isaiah, who teaches that a pious nucleus of the people, under the figure of the Servant

of the Lord, will bring the rest of Israel back to its allegiance to God, and will convert the heathen, so that all shall share in the blessings of the Kingdom. Yet, with all these variations of detail, the idea of the Kingdom of God itself remains constant. It is set forth under all the loveliest forms of metaphor and imagery which poetry and inspiration can suggest. Peace and prosperity shall reign, so that even 'the wolf shall dwell with the lamb, and the leopard shall lie down with the kid; and the calf and the young lion and the fatling together; and a little child shall lead them. . . . They shall not hurt nor destroy in all my holy mountain; for the earth shall be full of the knowledge of the Lord, as the waters cover the sea' (Is. xi. 6, 9). God shall be always present; so that for Ezekiel, who foresaw the Kingdom under the figure of a new and renovated Jerusalem, 'The name of the city from that day shall be, The Lord is there' (Ez. xlviii. 35). It will be a time of great joy—a glad reunion of God and His people: 'In that day it shall be said to Jerusalem, Fear thou not: O Zion, let not thine hands be slack. The Lord thy God is in the midst of thee, a mighty one who will save: he will rejoice over thee with joy, he will rest in his love, he will joy over thee with singing' (Zeph. iii. 16, 17).

Even more highly coloured are the pictures drawn in some of the later fragments and books of the Old Testament. The last two chapters of Isaiah, for instance, belong to a time when prophecy is passing into apocalyptic. 'For, behold, I create new heavens and a new earth: and the former things shall not be remembered, nor come into mind. But be ye glad and rejoice for ever in that which I create: for, behold, I create Jerusalem a rejoicing, and her people a joy.' It is felt that the

earth is not good enough for God's Kingdom, and that therefore He will create a new one. By the time the Book of Daniel was written (about 167 B.C.) the transition was complete. He sees the Kingdom in a vision, typified by the appearance of a human figure brought near to God, and following upon four beasts, who represent four successive empires; the upshot of the vision being that 'the kingdom and the dominion, and the greatness of the kingdoms under the whole heaven, shall be given to the people of the saints of the Most High: his kingdom is an everlasting kingdom, and all dominions shall serve and obey him' (Dan. vii. 27). In the apocalyptic books as a whole we miss somewhat the ethical and liberal note of most of the Old Testament prophets. But the circumstances under which they appeared, and which they were intended to meet, largely account for this. They were written during the two centuries preceding our era, when the Jewish people suffered from the yoke first of Syria, and then of Rome, and when even the military successes of the Maccabees could not withstand the inner religious corruption which the spread of Greek influences was producing. There was a deeper pessimism prevailing then than in the prophetic days; and it is not surprising that the Kingdom, the coming of which was shortly to deliver the people of God, should under a natural reaction be set forth, as in the Book of Enoch and the Sibylline Oracles, in over-fanciful and spectacular colours. Yet even so the conditions required of those who are to enter the Kingdom are strongly ethical in such books as the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs, the Psalms of Solomon, and the latter portions of the Book of Enoch.

The importance of the apocalyptic books lies in the

fact that they bridge the gulf between the prophets of the Old Testament and the age of our Lord. They enable us to understand how the conception of the coming of the Kingdom of God which He preached was not a novel one, nor yet an old one, which had fallen into desuetude, and was now revived, but rather a current conception. Their value to us to-day, that is to say, is not spiritual, but genetic. This distinction should be a sufficient assurance to those who maintain that the Canon of Scripture alone contains all that is necessary for the interpretation of Christ's message, and who distrust any resort to non-canonical and little-known books. In point of fact, if Scripture be taken, as it should be, to include the Apocrypha, we have little need to go outside the Bible. But in any case, no claim is made that the Book of Enoch, for example, is an integral part of the revelation which prepared the way for Christ. All that is asserted is that that book, and others like it, help us to determine with a new degree of historical accuracy the contemporary meaning of terms and phrases, as they fell from our Lord's lips. An illustration may be taken from other literature. The spiritual ancestry of Dante runs through all the great poets of the past, above all Virgil ; and a knowledge of them is indispensable as an initiation into the poetry of the great mediævalist. But at the same time there is much that can only be understood after a perusal of the obscure Italian books and poems which preceded Dante himself. It is from them, not from Virgil, that we shall learn how to interpret the countless passages where the point depends upon local or contemporary ways of thought.

It is in this way that we find the apocalyptic books useful for the understanding of the Gospels. We are

not surprised, after reading them, to find mention in the Gospels of one like Simeon, who was 'righteous and devout, looking for the consolation of Israel'; of 'all them that were looking for the redemption of Jerusalem,' to whom Anna, the prophetess, spoke of the presentation of Jesus; or of another, such as Joseph of Arimathæa, 'who was looking for the Kingdom of God.' And indeed the fact of the currency of the idea is presupposed in the message of the Baptist, and in the opening words of our Lord's public ministry: 'The Kingdom of God is at hand.' But only the literature of the two centuries immediately before our era testifies to us that the expectation of the advent of this Kingdom formed a continuous and undying element in the religion of the Jewish people, until the coming of the Messiah whom they rejected.

One further observation arises out of a study of the apocalyptic books which bears upon our investigation of Christ's teaching about the Kingdom. We are not restricted for our evidence to such passages in the New Testament as speak only of the Kingdom itself. For the coming of the Kingdom is only one link—though the most important—in a chain of interrelated events which had been systematised in popular expectation. The Kingdom is no isolated idea. Judgment, the end of the world, Messiah, Heaven, and Hell—all these, and many other conceptions are bound up with it. Roughly speaking, religious opinion among the Jews during the two centuries immediately preceding our era wavered between two sets or systems of ideas on the subject. On the one side men looked forward to an endless Messianic Kingdom, to be ushered in by a Judgment over which a personal Messiah presided, and enjoyed by the righteous

in a new heaven and new earth ;[1] on the other, we find the hope of a temporary Kingdom in this world, usually without a Messiah, consisting of Israelites, and culminating in an eternal life beyond the grave, a life of joy for the righteous, of punishment for the sinners and the heathen.[2] But while the writings of this period attest twin streams of thought, it seems that only the first of them had a widespread hold on the people. The Gospels, for instance, which reflect so much of the popular expectation of the time of Jesus, betray no sign of a belief in a Judgment which came after the Kingdom was over, or a Kingdom which was only to be for a space. The other creed, however, appears in every quarter. The sting of our Lord's woes upon the lake cities lies just in this—that the Judgment which they expected so eagerly would indeed come, but in its character belie their hopes so tragically. So ready were the populace to acclaim the Kingdom that they hailed it, as by anticipation, at the triumphal entry of Jesus into Jerusalem. Nay, the hope—or the fear—of a Messiah had penetrated even into the courts of kings ; so that a Herod could be thought to speak of going to worship him. When, therefore, Jesus spoke of the coming of the Kingdom, His words called up also many associated ideas in His hearers' minds ; or, conversely, what He says or implies

[1] Illustrative of this group are Daniel, the greater part of the Book of Enoch, especially the Similitudes, the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs, and probably the Psalms of Solomon. Not all the characteristics of the group show themselves in each of these books ; *e.g.* there is no Messiah in Daniel. But on the whole the type is constant in all.

[2] This group would be exemplified in the closing chapters of Enoch, the Book of Jubilees, the Assumption of Moses, and books which betray Alexandrian influence, such as the Sibylline Oracles, and (later) Wisdom, Philo, and the Slavonic Enoch.

of the immediate coming of the Judgment or of Messiah applies equally to the coming of the Kingdom. Indeed, the three conceptions are combined in the clearest way, when He says: 'Whosoever shall be ashamed of me and of my words in this adulterous and sinful generation, the Son of Man also shall be ashamed of him, when he cometh in the glory of his Father with the holy angels. And he said unto them, Verily I say unto you, there be some here of them which stand by, which shall in no wise taste of death, till they see the Kingdom of God come with power.'

But the apocalyptic creed did not stop here. Not content with figuring to itself the central events of the end of the world, it had also highly developed notions of what should precede them. Such catastrophe must have due preludes, whether it be abnormalities of nature, such as the eclipse of the sun, or disturbances of human society through the increase of war and anarchy. Among the scribes it was popularly taught that Messiah should have a personal forerunner in the person of Elijah, whose return before the Day of the Lord had been prophesied by Malachi. His task was to turn the hearts of the people to righteousness; and the notion was expanded by the rabbis into a doctrine that Israel must become righteous before the New Age could come. As an offset to this, we have another sign of the approaching end in the uprising of Beliar or of Antichrist,[1] and his final overthrow by Michael or even by Messiah Himself. Indeed, this oscillation of the forces of good and evil is a striking feature of the signs of the end, and seems to have had a place in the outlook of the Lord Himself.

[1] *E.g.* Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs, Sibylline Oracles, Apocalypse of Baruch.

At the other term also of the catastrophe we find expectation sharply defined in certain respects. The fate of those, who were found wanting in the Judgment and were rejected from the Kingdom, was depicted in lurid colours. Gehenna, or some special part of Sheol, was the place of their confinement; and they are burnt and suffer torture before the eyes of the elect. Indeed, it is in these apocalyptic books that we find the fountain-head of those eschatological ideas which play so large a part in mediæval art. The connection, for instance, between the Book of Enoch and the frescoes of the Campo Santo at Pisa is a very simple and direct one. As to those, on the other hand, who were saved in the Lord's Day, their felicity is expressed in various ways; but none is more popular than the picture of a banquet. The Messianic meal was typical not only of bountiful plenty, but also of social peace and concord, and as such forms a common feature in the expectation of the Kingdom of God.

And, finally, provision was made for the dead. The purposeless limbo, to which nearly all Old Testament writers consigned the departed, made way now for a doctrine of Resurrection. Its clearest enunciation is in Daniel. 'And many of them that sleep in the dust of the earth shall awake, some to everlasting life, and some to shame and everlasting contempt.' Authorities differed as to who should rise: with some it was the righteous only, after the Judgment; with others it was good and bad alike, and they would pass through the Judgment like those who were living when it came. In this doctrine the Jews found the answer they needed to the problem of undeserved pain; it was perhaps in part elicited by the questionings of Job. At any rate, it

enabled them to give to the dominion of God a universality which before had seemed morally impossible.

Such, then, are the outstanding elements in the apocalyptic hopes of the end—such the principal dogmas of their eschatological creed. The coming of Elijah to restore the people to righteousness, the emergence of Antichrist in unabashed infamy and his defeat, unrest in social life, and portents in nature—these are the preludes of the end. Then comes Messiah in Judgment in the clouds, dealing out to the unregenerate a future of pain, and rewarding the righteous with the joys of fellowship in the heavenly Kingdom. At the same time there would be a rending of the grave, and the dead would rise again to Judgment, and to the fate which was dispensed them there. So that over all mankind, both past and present, would be exercised the sovereignty of God.

When an expectation such as that of the Kingdom of God had been invested with such different content at different times—when, indeed, the only constant factors in it had been the belief that it meant God's unimpeded sovereignty on earth or on a new earth, and the conviction that it would come very shortly—it is only natural that the Jews of the days of Jesus Christ should regard it in many lights. The majority would seem to have counted upon a great political upheaval, wherein God would intervene, and would release His people from foreign rule and restore once more the Kingdom to Israel. Of those who held this view, some, namely the Zealots, were inclined to be violent, fanatical, and revolutionary; it was their spirit which fanned the flame of the many insurrections described for us by Josephus. Others, on the other hand, among whom the large body of Pharisees would number themselves, thought that any human

action was unavailing, and were prepared to keep the Law and leave the rest with God. But as well as these there was doubtless a considerable leaven among the people, and indeed among the Pharisees and scribes, of those who longed for the Kingdom on ethical and religious, rather than on political, grounds. They were the meek and the poor in spirit whom Jesus blessed. Yet they cannot have been many: it was only after a difficult training that even the chosen Twelve were purged of the political side of their hopes. All the more striking, then, must have been the trumpet-call of the Baptist, who bade men to repent, because the Kingdom was at hand. It was by men's fruits that they would be judged worthy or unworthy of entrance into the coming Kingdom. Even their descent from Abraham would profit them nothing. Membership of the Jewish people had no necessary relation to membership in the Kingdom of God. And so powerful was John's preaching, that, despite this stern and trenchant note, multitudes flocked to hear him. A careful investigation of it would not fall within the scope of this book. Suffice it here to say that, largely as a result of the Baptist's message, the people of much of Southern Palestine were in a ferment about the Kingdom when our Lord began His teaching; and that he had warned them that its content was ethical and not political. Even Jesus Himself went to be baptized, that He might 'fulfil all righteousness.' It was then, it would seem, that by a voice from Heaven, audible to Him alone, He became finally assured of His Mission and of His peculiar sonship to God; and it was from that date that He began 'to teach and to preach the things pertaining to the kingdom of God.'

Like the prophets and seers of old, Jesus saw in the

coming of the Kingdom the delivery from a thraldom; but it was a spiritual, not a political, thraldom which enchained mankind. 'Woe unto the world because of offences! for it must needs be that offences come; but woe to that man by whom the offence cometh!' The necessity of evil in the world is no excuse for sin in the individual. Both alike, however, Jesus attributes to the agency of Satan. On the one hand, the world is at that moment largely under Satan's dominion. This 'pessimism' of Jesus is not so much expressed as implied; as, for instance, when He cries out, on hearing how the seventy had cast out devils: 'I beheld Satan fallen as lightning from heaven.' Or again, how could Satan tempt Him with the gift of the world's kingdoms, unless for the mind of the Tempted they were Satan's to give? Proof that they were such was not wanting, while the Holy City was in the hands of the Romans. Further, it is clear that Christ regarded disease, no less than sin, as due to diabolic agency;[1] and their universality afforded some measure of the tyranny from which men were to be delivered into the Kingdom. No wonder that He is 'hemmed in,' until His 'baptism' is accomplished on Calvary; and we shall surely not be discounting the irony of the adage: 'Sufficient for the day is the evil thereof,' if we see reflected in it His real estimate of 'the tears of life.'

And, on the other hand, the devil had hold of the souls of individuals, in whom his universal sway was particularised. He is the tempter who sifts men as wheat, and keeps watch that he may snatch away any good

[1] Cf. Luke xiii. 16. It is worth noting that this conception of the sway of Satan is exactly reproduced in St. Paul: cf. 2 Cor. iv. 4; 1 Cor. ii. 6-8, xv. 24; Rom. xvi. 20.

sown in the heart. And so great is his success that evil has become a characteristic of men. 'If ye, being evil . . .,' says Jesus; and again, when one accosts Him as 'Good Master,' He disowns the title: 'None is good save one, even God.' It is possible that behind these words there lies the thought of the twenty-second Psalm, with its burden of spiritual isolation among an unrighteous people. Be that as it may, Christ's keen and vivid recognition of the hold which the influences of evil had on men's wills flashes out frequently from the Synoptic narrative. It was from this bondage that God would shortly deliver those who repented betimes, just as of old He had promised deliverance from the yoke of foreign oppression. Now, as then—though now on a scale which was more universal because the individual, not the nation, is the ultimate religious unit—man's need was God's opportunity.

These facts would warrant us in setting aside much modern portraiture of our Lord without further ado. Many writers, both here and on the Continent—among whom perhaps Renan is the main offender—have endeavoured to represent our Lord in the habiliments of contemporary prosperity. Blind to the moral corruption which He saw, and forgetful of the political and social ruin which He experienced, they have ventured even to use of Him such epithets as 'amiable' and 'sunny.' Against such interpretation the pages of the Gospels cry aloud. Yet, on the other hand, we must be careful not to exaggerate the 'pessimism.' There is no more ground in His teaching for a Calvinistic doctrine of total depravity than for the assertions of Naturalism that sin is only a passing imperfection. Rather Christ's pessimism is tempered by an ultimate optimism at both

extremes of man's story—as regards His essential standing, that is to say, in God's eyes, and as regards His eventual purpose and destiny. His view of man is in its main features consonant with that which was traditional in the Hebrew Scriptures—to wit, that he is the object of God's infinite solicitude,[1] endowed with powers which are to be exercised in God's service; that he is, however, corrupted by evil; and that only by repentance can he reclaim his lost privileges. Man began in God's image; what he is to attain to is God's likeness. He began as God's servant; he is to become His son. No limit indeed is set to the development of human possibilities. 'Ye therefore shall be perfect, as your heavenly Father is perfect.'

Finally, the secret of the paradox, whereby Jesus held together the twin truths of man's high origin and destiny and of his corrupted condition, lies in the distinction which betrays itself in all His words and actions between the sinner and his sin. He could see the saving grace of every character beneath its outward shame. 'Verily, I say unto you, that the publicans and the harlots go into the kingdom of God before you.' It is no wonder that He shocked His contemporaries by keeping such company! Theirs was not the rare unblunted keenness of moral sense, which could penetrate through all a man's actions to the secret well of hope and aspiration never wholly stanched. 'But when they continued asking him, he lifted up himself, and said unto them, He that is without sin amongst you, let him first cast a stone at her. . . . And they, when they heard it, went

[1] Matt. xviii. 14, vi. 26; Mark viii. 36, 37. In *Christianity at the Cross-Roads*, Father Tyrrell recognises that Christ's view of man's ultimate destiny was 'optimistic': he says nothing of His equally 'optimistic' view of his origin.

out one by one . . . : and Jesus was left alone, and the woman, where she was, in the midst. And Jesus lifted up himself, and said unto her, Woman, where are they ? Did no man condemn thee ? And she said, No man, Lord. And Jesus said, Neither do I condemn thee : go thy way : from henceforth sin no more.' In that inimitably poignant scene—saved for us as it apparently was by a kind of literary accident—stands revealed the attitude of Jesus to the need and the hope of men.

Christ, then, like the prophets and apocalyptists before Him, was faced with an emergency ; and like them He brought to meet it the good news of approaching deliverance at the hands of God. This setting of His message suggests that He conceived the Kingdom of God as future, and such a view is borne out by a considerable majority of the passages in which He speaks of it.[1] The early teaching of Jesus, for instance, is summarised in the words of the First Gospel : 'From that time began Jesus to preach, and to say, Repent ye ; for the kingdom of heaven is at hand.' A little later He teaches His disciples to pray : 'Thy kingdom come.' At the Last Supper He said : 'Verily I say unto you, I will no more drink of the fruit of the vine, until that day when I drink it new in the kingdom of God.' Such simple and yet fundamental sayings would seem to exclude any belief in an immanent Kingdom ; and this probability is enhanced when we examine the ideas of the earliest Christians. That the primitive Church regarded the Kingdom as still future may be seen from St. Peter's speeches in the early part of the Acts and from St. Paul's

[1] I have analysed these passages, sub-dividing them into those which belong to the Marcan narrative, those which were probably in Q, and those which appear to be due to the First or Third

Epistles to the Thessalonians. The burden of the latter especially is the Christian hope of being 'counted worthy' of the Kingdom when it should come. It is never even suggested that Christians already possessed it. True, in

Evangelists respectively or to their peculiar sources. For convenience the results may be arranged in tabular form as follows:—

Reference of time.	Mark.	Matthew.			Luke.		
		Mark.	Q.	Pec.	Mark.	Q.	Pec.
Referring to the future .	6	4	4	8	4	3	6
		16			13		
Without note of time .	6	6	6	9	5	3	2
		21			10		
Referring to the present .	1	1	4	5	2	3	1
		10			6		
	13	47			29		

Omitting the middle horizontal row, representing passages which can obviously go equally well with either of the other two, we notice that in each Gospel considerably more kingdom-passages refer to a future kingdom than to a present one. The same is true of the constituent elements in each Gospel, with the exception of Q. The Q passages seem equally divided between the future and the present kingdom, when they refer to time at all. Those referring to the present are all discussed in the text. Taking the Gospels as a whole, the proportions I have given are slightly on the side of generosity; for, where 'the kingdom' occurs in the introduction to parables, I have never included it as having a future reference, even if the parable itself implies that, as *e.g.* in the parable of the Ten Virgins; while, on the other hand, I have given it a present reference if the parable itself could reasonably be taken as teaching a present kingdom: in all other cases I have reckoned the passage as a 'neutral' one in point of time.

the period covered by the New Testament writings, we can trace a steady process of ante-dating the advent of the Kingdom—of bringing it back from the future into the present; until the climax is reached in the Johannine writings, where 'eternal life' is the present possession of those who believe. But this is a development from a temper of naïve expectation and looking forward to the restoration of all things.

Yet a strong body of scholars,[1] who cannot lightly be set aside, contends for the other view, and maintains that Jesus believed the Kingdom to be already present as well as future. We must do full justice to their position, if our investigation is to lead to sound results. They remind us that He who cried, 'Repent! for the kingdom of heaven is at hand,' also said: 'The kingdom of heaven is within you.' They point to a number of sayings of Jesus which imply that He regarded the Kingdom as already present, and to some which explicitly affirm it. Moreover, if the appeal lie to the thought of the primitive Church, it was within twenty-five or thirty years of the Master's death that St. Paul wrote: 'The kingdom of God is not eating and drinking, but righteousness and peace and joy in the Holy Ghost' (Rom. xiv. 17). Christ's gospel of the Kingdom, on this view, was in the main an awakening of ethical and religious activities which had too long lain smothered beneath Jewish legalism.

Here we seem face to face with an antithesis. For the two views as they stand cannot be combined. Jesus

[1] *E.g.* Harnack, Wellhausen, and most of the Liberal Protestant school in Germany, and the majority of English theologians. Against them we have to set such scholars as Joh. Weiss, Schweitzer, Loisy, and Prof. Burkitt; also the Jewish scholar, Montefiore.

can hardly have looked forward to a good time coming, and all the while believed that it had already come. The truth is that, as it stands, the second view will not survive criticism. In the Synoptic Gospels themselves the passages which seem to speak of a present, immanent Kingdom are the exception; they have to be sought for and enumerated. Again, the passage appealed to in St. Paul's letter to the Romans represents, not the earliest belief of the apostles, but just that development of his view of the Kingdom of which mention has already been made. We should expect that there would be something in the authentic tradition of Christ's teaching which would render this development natural; we may reasonably be asked to explain how the apostle came to the conviction he expresses in the later epistles; but we are entitled to maintain that, for this purpose, we are not bound to follow the naïve interpretations of certain of Jesus's sayings which are adduced by the Liberal school in Germany.

For, if we take them in detail, we shall find that all admit of one of two other explanations. Either (*a*) they do not imply any note of time; or (*b*) if the present time is implied, it is as the anticipation of something which is in its own nature future. The first of these groups is well exemplified in such a passage as Matt. xi. 11, 12: 'Verily I say unto you, Among them that are born of woman there hath not arisen a greater than John the Baptist: yet he that is but little in the kingdom of heaven is greater than he. And from the days of John the Baptist until now the kingdom of heaven suffereth violence, and men of violence take it by force.' Is it not straining matters to see in the present tenses in these verses a proof that the Kingdom is regarded as already

present ? In verse 11 the copula 'is,' if indeed it ever occurred in the Aramaic which our Lord spoke, is not meant to give any hint of time, but goes closely with the word 'greater,' and simply marks the comparison between two estates of men—between him that is lesser in the Kingdom and the greatest of the prophets.[1] Verse 12 presents greater difficulty, as the meaning of the words is far from clear. If, however, as will be urged in a later chapter, the words describe the wave of repentance caused by the preaching of the coming Kingdom, so that the Kingdom may be thought of as already 'suffering violence' or 'being forced on,' the argument based on the use of the present tenses falls to the ground.

But, leaving aside this group of sayings which are in truth irrelevant to the problem, we find a number of others which imply in some sense the presence of the Kingdom. Yet not in complete reality, not in the fulness of power, but rather putatively, by way of guarantee. And this in more ways than one. It is present, in that its powers are already visibly at work: 'If I by the finger of God cast out devils, then is the kingdom of God come upon you.'[2] It is present in the sense that the

[1] The meaning of the phrase is illustrated by Luke xi. 27, 28. A similar reasoning will show that Matt. xix. 24 and xxi. 31 cannot fairly be adduced in favour of the view here being discussed. So, too, Matt. v. 3; xiii. 11; xviii. 1, 3, 4; xix. 14; xiii. 44, 45, 52. The phrase 'is like' at the beginning of a parable clearly implies no notice of time; else we should have to suppose that the variant 'was likened' referred to the past.

[2] Luke xi. 20; Matt. xii. 28, with 'spirit' for 'finger.' Some scholars interpret the Greek word for 'is come' by its meaning in modern colloquial Greek, as meaning 'is coming immediately.' Cf. 1 Thess. ii. 16. In that case, the saying falls in with all those which refer to a kingdom which is to come in the immediate future. Space forbids me to dwell here on the apparent twist in the argument involved in the context of this passage.

Messiah is already here, though not revealed as such—a sense which our Lord hints at when He asks: 'Can ye make the sons of the bride-chamber fast, while the bridegroom is with them?' It is present, in the sense that the good news of it is spreading among the people. Jesus uses the phrase 'the kingdom of God' very commonly, when He seems to mean the 'word' of the Kingdom. The distinction is expressly made in the case of the parable of the Sower, where He draws out the different kinds of reception which were given to 'the word' in different quarters. But it probably lies latent, though unexpressed, in other parables. It is of the message of the Kingdom that He is thinking when He compares the Kingdom to mustard seed, and contrasts the small beginning with the final issue; or to leaven which spreads quickly and triumphantly in that which environs it; or to seed sown secretly, which grows into the ripe fruit of harvest. In the case of all the parables, indeed, we have to be careful not to press the words: 'The kingdom of God is like.' They are little more than a formal introduction, meaning: 'Some feature in the following picture is a representation of some feature in the Kingdom of God.'[1] And, finally, there are passages in which the term appears to be used undeniably of the whole body of those who accepted our Lord's message.

Such is the case with the parables of the Tares and the Drag-net, which teach that for the time being the 'Kingdom' contains both good and bad, while the former teaches also that the discrimination between them is not the proper duty of man, but must be left to the Judg-

[1] I owe this way of putting it to Professor Burkitt: cf. his paper called 'The Parables of the Kingdom of Heaven' (*Interpreter* for Jan. 1911, p. 140).

ment of God. So full are these parables of the notion of a community already in existence as identical with the Kingdom, that one great commentator does not hesitate to set them down as not authentic sayings of Jesus. Such a conclusion is too sweeping; for in both of them the stamp of the parable of Jesus is too patent: though it may well be that some of their colouring is due to a later age. Moreover, it seems clear that the Lord did use the term 'the kingdom of heaven' in an anticipatory sense, covering under it those who by their readiness to listen and repent were (if we may use the metaphor) staking-out for themselves a claim in the Kingdom which was to come. It was thus that those who repented were taking the Kingdom by storm; that the publicans and harlots were going into the Kingdom before the scribes and elders of the people; that the Kingdom was being shut against many who would fain enter by the hard-heartedness of the Pharisees. These passages taken together constitute adequate foundation on which to base the claim that Jesus spoke of the Kingdom as in a sense present. But that is all that we can say; and the claim is fully met if we suppose, as has been urged above, that our Lord's words imply a projection back of that which was in itself regarded as future; in face of the supernatural powers already at work, of the presence of the Messiah, though as yet veiled, and of the wave of penitence which His preaching evolved, the Kingdom may be said to have come in the sense of being already rendered certain. The people on their side had the Kingdom already *on credit*; and God on His side was giving vouchers that soon their credit would be converted into actual payment.

Yet before closing this part of our inquiry, we must

consider one much-canvassed passage, on which more than on any other the doctrine of the immanence of the Kingdom is built. I refer to Luke xvii. 20, 21 : 'And being asked by the Pharisees, when the kingdom of God cometh, he answered them and said, The kingdom of God cometh not with observation : neither shall they say, Lo, here ! or lo, there ! for lo, the kingdom of God is within you.' It is possible to interpret this passage along the lines of eschatological expectation ; and the subsequent context would at first sight seem to support such an exegesis. One might then paraphrase somewhat as follows : 'The Kingdom of God is not something that can be watched for ; it has no premonitory signs to herald its advent, like birds that fly before the storm : there will not even be time to say, Lo, here ! or there ! ' —such is the force of the future tense in 'neither shall they say '—'before the Kingdom of God is in your midst.' [1] This interpretation has the advantage of consistency in the conception of the Kingdom, and of suitability to the context, which is strongly eschatological. But it may be questioned whether on both scores we are not paying too heavy a price. The eschatological context may have literary, not historical, grounds : the mention of 'Lo, here ! or there ! ' in the words of Jesus to the Pharisees may have suggested to the evangelist other words of His to the disciples, in which the phrase occurred. They do not seem to have lain together in his source. And it is a mistake to strain

[1] Dalman, the Aramaic scholar, maintains that the word which Jesus used was most probably 'among,' not 'within.' It should be mentioned that some scholars, such as Pfleiderer, do not believe the saying to be a genuine one, but attribute it to the influence of the theological development traced in chapter VI. of this book.

after consistency, especially when, as we have seen, Jesus spoke of the coming of the Kingdom in more senses than one. This is not to admit the modern doctrine of immanence as a possible interpretation; for it would have nothing else to support it in His teaching, and indeed runs counter to much of it. But there are other avenues along which to approach to the discovery of its meaning.

Now the mention of the fact that the words were an answer to a question by the Pharisees prepares us to see in them an *argumentum ad hominem*. Whether or not His interrogators had expressed it, Jesus knew that at the back of their minds there was always the hankering after a sign. They were, in fact, the very people who were 'watching for' the coming of the Kingdom, and not in any ethical sense, but rather as a star-gazer watches the heavens. The opening words, therefore, come as a rebuke: 'Know this, at any rate; your watching for outward signs, your hanging upon sensational rumour, have no bearing upon the kingdom's advent: that is not how it will come.' Then the rebuke turns to something practical: 'The kingdom of heaven is among you, within your own body of Israel.' Its powers were at work there and then: all around them men were repenting, and being healed, and believing: that was enough for them to know about the Kingdom of Heaven. In other words, we should interpret the words, not as a theological dictum about the Kingdom, but as a practical reminder that a certain sphere of spiritual activities was there for them to enter. When they had made the ethical change involved in entering it, then perhaps they might learn more about the coming of the Kingdom itself. It is noteworthy that in the

following verses, where He speaks of the Kingdom eschatologically, He addresses Himself to the disciples. All the chief eschatological passages indeed are addressed to them; whereas all those in which Jesus speaks of the Kingdom as though it were present,[1] are addressed to the Pharisees or the multitudes. These latter were not in a position to understand much about the Kingdom; but they could at least take in the evidences of their eyes.

The principle of our Lord's method which seems here disclosed is perhaps best illustrated in a saying of His which has caused great perplexity. He is speaking about His parables to the disciples, when He is alone with them: 'Unto you is given the mystery of the kingdom of God: but unto them that are without, all things are done in parables: that seeing they may see, and not perceive; and hearing they may hear, and not understand; lest haply they should turn again, and it should be forgiven them.' We cannot believe that Jesus wished any to be unforgiven. But it was vitally necessary to have a test. A certain level of discernment must be reached before men were fit to be instructed to the Kingdom of Heaven. The sovereign power which should draw men to believe in the Kingdom was the personality of the Lord Himself. But Him the leaders of the people were rejecting. And in so doing they demonstrated their unfitness to profit by His teaching. He would not cast pearls before those who would trample them under foot. Yet equally He would not leave them wholly unprovoked to know the meaning of His message: among the unbelievers there would be many individuals whose

[1] The principal references are given in earlier paragraphs and in the notes attaching to them at the end of the book, the group classed (*a*) on p. 23 not being, of course, included.

spirits might be fired by the appeal of the beyond. And so He needed both to conceal, and yet to disclose, His message. The parables answered just such a double purpose. They did not tell all; but they showed that there was something to tell. If they moved men so far as to join the body of the followers of Jesus, they did enough. Where they failed to do that, the result was to establish more firmly men's alienation—a result of the parables which the Lord by a flash of irony describes as though it were their object. And this principle has been infinitely far-reaching. In one way, it would be true to say that the history of the Christian Church begins when Jesus spoke His first parable. It is then at least that He first marks the disentanglement of the disciples of the Kingdom from the religious world around them; and Christian thought has never since been eager to minimise the cleavage. Rather it has always insisted that for 'those outside' the first step in the knowledge of God must be the desire to give allegiance to Christ; and that only when that was premised could Christ's teaching be appreciated or understood. Christianity, that is, does not enter the lists of philosophic debate as one of the rival theories of things. No shafts of outer criticism can lay bare its meaning. That can only be come at from within.

The upshot of this crucial inquiry, then, would be somewhat as follows. The express teaching of our Lord, for the most part, and the course of His ministry, show that for Him the Kingdom of Heaven was something which was not yet on earth, but was still to be. Yet in a putative and fiduciary sense it was possible to speak of it as though it were already present, whether in the person and works of the Messiah, or in the hearts of those who turned to His message.

And this interpretation also suggests[1] the sense in which the early Church came to regard the Kingdom as present. Among those who believed in the Kingdom and in Jesus the Messiah, the characteristics of the Kingdom—its miraculous powers, its inward working in the heart—were facts of experience. Faith had transmuted the future into the present; it gave believers the first instalment of the possession they would soon enjoy entirely. It is thus that the Church of the middle of the first century regarded the Kingdom as present, and that their belief may be justified from the words of Christ Himself.

[1] I am careful to use no stronger term. I hope in a later chapter to show that the kingdom was present to the first Christians in a fuller sense than to those who knew the Lord only in 'the days of His flesh.'

CHAPTER II

THE PREACHING OF THE KINGDOM

If for Jesus the Kingdom is in itself something future and yet to come, certain simple questions present themselves at once. We may set them down as four. The first concerns the time of it: *when* will the Kingdom come? Will it be soon or late? We shall want to know the *manner* of it, what is involved in its coming, what, if any, signs it has to prelude it. Again, we ask, *where* will it come? Here on earth, or elsewhere? And, finally, *who* will belong to it? Let us take these four questions in order.

1. Two sets of answers hold the field as regards the time when Jesus expected the Kingdom to come. The one maintains that He expected it immediately, the other that He reckoned on and provided for its delay. And when we come to close quarters with the evidence, it would seem as though it bore out both these views. On the one hand, it is clear that for the most part His teaching implied such immediacy. It is not merely a matter of pointing to the impression to this effect left in the minds of His hearers, as shown in the early chapters of the Acts of the Apostles; nor of collecting isolated sayings or parables where He expressly states it, though such are not hard to find. Whatever, for instance, be the meaning of those difficult words: 'Ye shall not have

gone through all the cities of Israel till the Son of Man be come'[1]—they can mean no less than this. Rather is it that our Lord's belief in the imminence of the Kingdom is a conviction that is borne in upon us by His whole history, as the Gospels record it. He gives to John the Baptist the rôle of Elias, foretold in Malachi as the precursor of Judgment; He claims that in His miracles the powers of the Kingdom are already at work by anticipation; He sends out His disciples to preach one message—to wit, that the Kingdom is at hand; finally Himself, when no other means avail, goes up to the Holy City to hasten by His own death its coming. Facts spring up on every side, like soldiers at a word of command, to support us, if we say that Jesus taught the immediate coming of the Kingdom.

And yet, on the other hand, there is a certain body of counter-evidence—small in quantity, yet apparently quite explicit—which cannot be disregarded. According to one of the most unmistakably genuine traditions which we have in the Gospels, Jesus said of His coming in judgment: 'But of that day or that hour knoweth no one, not even the angels in heaven, neither the Son, but the Father.'[2] This disowning of knowledge must extend to the time as well as to other features of the day: and it must qualify any conclusion we come to as to our Lord's expectation of the Kingdom. But we have more positive evidence than this in the shape of sayings and parables, which seem plainly to imply an interval before everything should have come to pass. Perhaps the most striking passage is the saying of our Lord to the disciples: 'The days will come, when ye shall desire to see one of the days of the Son of Man, and ye shall not

[1] Matt. x. 23. [2] Mark xiii. 32.

see it.' [1] The context shows that it is no regret for past days which is intended here, but the hope of promised ones—a hope, moreover, which shall prove to be a hope deferred. In the case of the parables we must be careful to remember that their primary point is a moral one, and that they may only have the same object as St. Paul's exhortation to his converts at Thessalonica, when some of them were making the near approach of the end an excuse for idleness. None the less they carry by implication advice for a period of waiting.

The parables of the Talents and the Pounds—possibly different versions of the same parable—imply a period of long delay,[2] during which the Lord's servants may make good and profitable use of what He has given them; while the latter is said by St. Luke to have been expressly spoken 'because He was nigh to Jerusalem, and because they supposed that the kingdom of God was immediately to appear.' In the parable of the Ten Virgins likewise it is said that 'the bridegroom tarried.' Still more striking, perhaps, is the short parable which St. Mark gives in one verse: 'It is as when a man, sojourning in another country, having left his house, and given authority to his servants, to each one his work, commanded also the porter to watch.' These parables seem to give a clear indication that Jesus made provision in His teaching for a period of delay before the Advent, and showed how it might be used.

Thus, while it is true that Jesus believed the Kingdom to be imminent, we have also to do justice to the facts which indicate that He believed the delay of its coming to be quite possible, or even probable. For the time

[1] Luke xvii. 22.

[2] See especially Matt. xxv. 19.

being let us leave this seeming inconsistency as it stands : later on we shall have to return to it.

2. Secondly, we ask : How shall the Kingdom come ? Suddenly, or only by degrees and by hard travail-pangs of birth ? By God's act, or as the term of human progress ? There are really two distinct questions here. The first is one for theologians, and has Christological bearings. The second has concerned Christian society of all ages, and underlies, even if unknown, all the political and social movements of to-day.

(*a*) With regard to the first of them, our Lord seems to leave His hearers in no doubt. In those parables, whose language has passed over into our common parlance, He says plainly that the Son of Man shall come suddenly like lightning or like a snare, secretly like the thief in the night, unexpectedly like the master returning from a banquet. And He compares it to the sudden judgments which came upon the world in Noah's time, or upon Sodom in the days of Lot. But, in truth, the matter cannot be settled so easily. For the Synoptic Gospels have all preserved for us a discourse [1] of Jesus on the Last Things, delivered during the last week of His life, wherein He enumerates the various events which shall prelude His coming. The common tradition of Jewish eschatology is followed : false Messiahs will arise, there will be ' wars and rumours of wars,' the elect will be persecuted, the temple will be profaned and Judæa beleaguered ; and, finally, amid the staggering of Heaven and its lights, the Son of Man shall come in clouds with great power and glory. These predictions of the break-up of human society and of

[1] Mark xiii. = Matt. xxiv. = Luke xxi., though Matt. and Luke have some of the Marcan matter in other contexts.

nature, the increase of iniquity, and the great affliction, are, as we have seen, part of the regular stock-in-trade of apocalyptic thought;[1] while the warning about Judæa —or, as St. Luke has it, about Jerusalem—is fully in the spirit of ancient prophecy.[2] This fact has led the great majority of critics to set down the discourse as in greater or less degree a Jewish or Jewish-Christian apocalypse, perhaps issued in part as a fly-leaf during the siege of Jerusalem in 70 A.D.[3] Many orthodox scholars, on the other hand, maintain that it is authentic, and that in it Jesus refers partly to the imminent ruin of the Holy City, partly to the end of the world, which by prophetic foreshortening He regards as near.[4] Between these two groups of views it is far from easy to decide.

Some writers have thought that the balance was inclined against the authenticity of the discourse by what our Lord says elsewhere about 'signs.' They urge that He repeatedly told His opponents that no sign should be given; whereas the eschatological discourse, if genuine, is little more than a chronicle of signs premonitory of the end of the world. But, in truth, this is only to confuse the issue by the introduction of irrelevant matter. For the 'signs' of which Jesus speaks in controversy with the scribes and Pharisees are not such general and public events as form the gist of the discourse. When He said that no sign should be given to His generation, He was replying to the Jewish desire that He

[1] Enoch xcix. 4-9; 4 Esdras v. 1-13; Ps. Sol. xvii. 21; Ass. Mos. x. 3-10; Test. Levi. iv. See previous chapter.

[2] The destruction and renovation of Jerusalem is not strange to apocalyptic either: cf. Enoch xc. 28, 29; Apoc. Bar. iv.

[3] Cf. Eusebius's *Ecclesiastical History*, iii. 5.

[4] *E.g.* Salmond in *The Christian Doctrine of Immortality*, Book III. chap. ii. So, too, B. Weiss from a different point of view.

should confirm His right to teach and lead the people by some supernatural evidence, such as a voice from Heaven. 'Sign' in this connection had, in fact, no eschatological reference. Its bearing is personal, not cosmic. The same is true of our Lord's observation that no sign shall be given, save the sign of the prophet Jonah. What is in question, and what needs to be established, is the authority of Jesus. He answers that His authority has ample credentials in His personality and His preaching—credentials which before now had been accepted even by heathen. They are the only 'sign' which He will give them.

And yet by implication this last passage has a certain bearing upon the eschatological discourse, though one which is, if anything, opposite to that alleged. Jesus disposes of the Jewish request for a 'sign'; for He and His preaching are themselves the sign. But of what? Of judgment. 'For even as Jonah became a sign unto the Ninevites, so shall also the Son of Man be to this generation.' There is force in the word 'became.' Jesus need not have been a sign to the Jews, as Jonah was to the Ninevites; but they were making Him one by their rejection: and the end signified could only be that which the event proved in the case of Nineveh—destruction. The upshot of the passage, then, is a clear adumbration of the destruction of Jerusalem.

It is here that we have the clue to the great discourse. In essence, it is a prophetical foreboding over the Holy City; and it bears all the features of similar presages of judgment, as we find them in the Old Testament. It is the custom of the prophets, when they depict the woe which hangs over some city or nation, to give the historical event a cosmic setting. The fires of a Sodom or a

Nineveh are seen against a background of mingled cloud and flame. In the Book of Joel, for example, the plague of locusts is a judgment; but behind it there looms another and a vaster judgment, with toppling heavens and stars all out of joint: and to the prophet's eye it seems to be following hard upon the first. So in our Lord's discourse we find the same interaction of the political and the cosmic—the same two outstanding features of historical catastrophe and the break-up of the world. Taken as a whole, and not phrase by phrase, the discourse is classical and true to type; it is what we might expect from the greatest of Israel's prophets.

Taken, then, as genuine, how does it affect our answer to the question from which we set out? We have seen that for the most part Jesus seems to have spoken of His coming as something sudden and unexpected, for which men would have no time of grace in which to prepare. Yet here it appears rather as the culmination of a period of political and religious upheaval crowned by the destruction of Jerusalem. For the nonce we will state the antinomy and leave it.

(*b*) The other question involved here is, on the contrary, a very live and practical one; and it is untrammelled by any critical difficulties. Does the Kingdom come by God's act, or by man's progress? Here is implicit the age-long controversy between Faith and Works, between Grace and Free-will. True, in our own day it takes on rather a different form. Does the Kingdom of God represent the term of human development on this planet, so that it can be positively brought about by social and legislative reform? Or is it rather of another order, and the work of the Divine Agency alone? If we read the Gospels, one answer, and one only, is

possible. The whole evidence goes to show that it is God or His supernatural Agent, and not man, who establishes His Kingdom. Man may indeed prepare for it in many ways: he can repent and pray and watch. But it is not his to bring it to pass. This is no easy doctrine for the Northerner, who has a natural bent towards Pelagianism, and a hardy belief in the intrinsic worth of his civilisation. It is this which is half responsible for his being outwardly Protestant. And yet at bottom he shares, too, in the worldly wisdom which is the genius of the Catholic Church. It was England's greatest biographer who wrote: 'This have I learnt from a pretty hard course of experience . . . that, until a steady conviction is obtained, that the present life is an imperfect state, and only a passage to a better, if we comply with the divine scheme of progressive improvement; and also that it is a part of the mysterious plan of Providence that intellectual beings must "be made perfect through suffering," there will be a continual recurrence of disappointment and uneasiness.' This 'conviction,' which cuts underneath both the pessimism and the optimism of feeling to an ultimate optimism at the root of things, finds its justification in Christ's teaching about the Kingdom. The Kingdom of God is not an ideal, as men commonly use that term. The ideals of our imagination recede as we approach them; of the Kingdom Jesus said that it should come by supernatural act. Human aspiration has indeed its place in the quest of a Kingdom which is infinite in spiritual meaning; and human endeavour must be quickened into moral intensity by the greatness of the prize to be won. But, at the last, the Kingdom is not worked out from within us; we cannot affect its character or con-

dition its coming as we choose : it is the gift of the Lord of Heaven.

3. And we find this conclusion reinforced when we inquire the answer to our third question : *where* shall the Kingdom come ? A sharp cleavage is visible throughout Jewish thought upon this problem. For the most part the prophets had pictured the Kingdom as an earthly paradise, where peace and plenty reigned together, after all Israel's enemies had been overthrown. Yet a few writers, struck with a deeper sense of this world's inadequacy, had placed its *venue* elsewhere ; and the promise of the last two chapters of Isaiah—' Behold, I create new heavens and a new earth '—was normative for this tradition of belief. It is this last to which our Lord lends His sanction. Not only is this implied in His language about the passing of heaven and earth ; but it is borne out by the testimony of several of the apostolic writers. And this doctrine has very salutary lessons for our own time. These are days of urgency. Not only are we challenged by clamorous needs and problems arising out of our social and industrial system at home, and out of the contact of that system with heathen civilisation abroad ; but all our modern postulates of progress have now been irrevocably disproved and done away by a world war of unparalleled magnitude and ferocity. Yet Christ and His Apostles were in like case. Chronic war, the practice of slavery, the gladiatorial shows, the extortions of Roman tax-gatherers, the custom of exposing weakly or inconvenient children [1] —these things were glaring evils of the society in which they lived. And yet they pass it by. They offer no

[1] See an interesting letter of date 1 B.C. in Deissmann's *Light from the Ancient East*, p. 154.

prospect of a comfortable millennium, when the greatest good of the greatest number will be realised. They look forward to no time when the whole world will be Christian. It is true that they germinate a temper and implant principles which must ultimately revolutionise the social environment in which they grow. They sow seed which is bound to bear fruit; and there is no age in the Church's history of which we could not say that it was high time for more fruit to ripen. But systems as such they do not attack, because systems are for earth; whereas the polity, which is the goal of their endeavours, abides elsewhere. It follows that the grounds of philanthropy and social reform must be found in other parts of His teaching than those which concern the Kingdom of Heaven. Such grounds, as we shall see later, are not hard to discover; they lie in many a parable, many a maxim, many a trenchant rebuke. But, when found, they are seen in a very different perspective from that which much of modern Protestantism tends to assign them. Our whole conception of progress has to be revolutionised before it will be Christian. We tend overmuch to lend sanction to the notion that improvement in the conditions and environment of life is good as an end; and that the prosperity of a nation and the efficiency of its individual citizens are an index of its spiritual health. But such is not the Christian view. For the Church, progress is not aptly simulated by the flow of a river, or the movement of a chariot; for those images give no picture of the end. And it is the end which matters. Perhaps the sand-storm gives a closer comparison, where two processes are at work together—the sand driven along the surface by the wind, and at the head mounting

to the sky; while the head itself ever advances and ever mounts.

Of the nature and conditions of the life which prevails in the Kingdom, when fully realised, Jesus gives us only a glimpse: 'In the resurrection they neither marry, nor are given in marriage, but are as the angels of heaven.' We betray a lack of poetry if we look here for information as to the character of the 'body' which will be ours beyond the grave. That is the plane on which the Sadducees, to whom our Lord spoke these words, wanted their answer. The reply of Jesus is in effect an assertion of irrelevancy. In the kingdom no marriage question arises; there is no need of generation and reproduction. For its citizens are not a perishable race, living under a perfect eugenic system. Rather, they are an immortal choir, whose work is always to do honour to the Godhead, and their ordered life a spontaneous embodiment of the harmony of Heaven.

4. And, finally, who shall belong to this Kingdom? Who are the 'many' who shall be gathered from all the quarters of the earth to participate with the saints of the Old Dispensation in the joys of the Lord's banquet? The answer is not simple.

When we inquire whether in the 'many' Jesus meant to include the Gentiles or not, we find divergent views holding the field. Some think that His idea of His mission was strictly limited by His Jewish outlook: salvation was for the Jews only. But at the outset we must premise that the Gospel tradition, inconsistent as it seems at first sight to be, is not our only guide in the matter. What, as a matter of fact, did the earliest Christians do with regard to it? For it presented itself to them practically. We are told that Philip baptized

an Ethiopian eunuch, and it does not appear that his action was considered abnormal. Peter and John early visited Samaria, sent by the Jerusalem elders to confirm the converts there. Finally—and here we are on firmer ground—St. Paul received a commission to evangelise the Gentiles, with orders to lay upon them obligations which from the standpoint of Jewish regulation were little more than formal. And this was within a few years of the Lord's death. Can these facts be accounted for on the view that Jesus Himself had charged that His Gospel should be restricted to the people of Israel? They would certainly allow us to believe that He meant the Gospel to be preached to the Jews first, and afterwards to the Gentiles. They would give ample room for the possibility of a development in the Lord's own attitude towards the question. They are consistent with the view that, so far as concerned His own preaching, it must be restricted to Israel, whatever might be the case later. But they do not admit of our asserting, on the score of a few passages, that Jesus thought of the membership of the Kingdom as national rather than Catholic.

And the evidence of the Gospels alone is by no means on one side only. It is true that in His charge to the disciples whom He sent out to preach He began with the words: 'Go not into any way of the Gentiles and enter not into any city of the Samaritans: but go rather to the lost sheep of the house of Israel' (Matt. x. 5, 6). Again, we cannot forget the reluctant non-possumus—in such contrast to the disciples' impatient rejection—with which He met the appeal of the Syro-Phœnician woman: 'I was not sent but unto the lost sheep of the house of Israel' (Matt. xv. 24). But these passages are the strongest supports of the conclusion we are dis-

cussing, and it is noteworthy that both of them are peculiar to the author of the First Gospel. This meagre evidence is hardly adequate foundation on which to build so important a superstructure. Moreover, we must be careful to distinguish: limitation in the scope of our Lord's personal mission does not involve limitation in the scope of the Gospel. The second of the sayings just alluded to only shows that, at one time at any rate, our Lord believed His own activities to be confined to the Jewish people. Likewise the command to the disciples is a command given for a particular occasion only. Rather, if we want to understand our Lord's view of the membership of the Kingdom, we shall find it best in another context. This context is His teaching about the Judgment. It is there that the parting of the ways would come, and the register of the Kingdom be decided. The orthodox opponents of our Lord believed that right of entry was *ipso facto* conferred by descent from Abraham; while the hope of the Kingdom was also extended to those Gentiles who observed the Jewish law. But when our Lord speaks of the Judgment, He knows nothing of these distinctions. Or rather, if he does, it is to turn the tables upon those who relied on them for privilege. So far as the Judgment is corporate, it will mean the rejection of the Jews, not their restoration. 'What therefore will the lord of the vineyard do? he will come and destroy the husbandmen, and will give the vineyard unto others.' Nay, the Ninevites and the Queen of Sheba—types of Gentiles who had shown grace in the past—should accuse and get condemnation passed upon this generation in the Judgment. The Jewish nation, *qua* nation, had no prescription in the coming of the Kingdom.

But we may go further. No nation, no corporate society, has any standing in the Judgment; for it is a moral discrimination, and as such deals with individuals. It is concerned not with Jew and Gentile, but with good and bad, sheep and goats, those who follow Jesus and those who turn back, those who are ashamed of Him and those who are not, the hard-hearted and those who repent. This is the line of cleavage which for our Lord runs through society; so that 'in that night there shall be two men on one bed; the one shall be taken and the other shall be left.' It is this pointed individualism of the Gospel which is the surest guarantee of its universality. The notion that Christ's religion suits certain peoples or types of character and not others is one that finds no support whatever in the teaching of the Lord Himself.

When this question is settled, the other and distinct one of the scope of our Lord's or of His disciples' preaching becomes of less moment. I have already suggested one or two possible explanations which do full justice to the evidence. The truth is that this practical problem very probably presented itself to our Lord as difficult. For, regarding, as He did, the coming of the Kingdom as imminent, He may well have asked Himself how the good tidings should reach in time those 'other sheep' which were not 'of this fold' (John x. 16), even while He felt assured that they could not be excluded. Indeed, those words from the Fourth Gospel may well be taken as summing up the attitude of Jesus Christ towards the salvation of the Gentiles. To the chosen people must the message first be given: 'let the children first be filled'—so Jesus said Himself, and so said the leaders of the primitive Church; but there were also many worthy of

the Kingdom who were as yet outside the Covenant; and Jesus believed that these too should join with the saints of old in the social life of the Kingdom of God.[1] Their names, like those of the apostles, were 'written in heaven.' It is this difficulty, perhaps, which is in our Lord's mind when He gives us the great picture of the Judgment recorded in the twenty-fifth chapter of St. Matthew. Critics have largely agreed in marking this discourse as not authentic. Be it so, if they will; though I confess that I can see no adequate reason for the view. It is of no great moment, since Christendom has recognised in it a perfect expression of the Spirit of Christ. And what does He there teach? 'Inasmuch as ye did it unto one of the least of these, ye did it unto me.' Where the service of Christ as Christ is not possible, He may be served as man. Good and loving men, though they have never heard the Christian religion—and those too who have heard it, but have in all sincerity been unable to accept it—shall be admitted to the privileges of the Kingdom. This is the charter of Christian liberalism.

[1] It will be noticed that I have omitted two passages often adduced in favour of the universalistic scope of Jesus's message, viz. Mark xiii. 10 and Matt. xxviii. 19. This is intentional, because neither can be vouched for as genuine. The first of these passages interrupts the context where it occurs, and is thought by many to be a Paulinism; the second is commonly regarded as a late addition of the end of the first century, though quite possibly representing an earlier charge on similar lines. On the other hand, Mark xiv. 9—'Wheresoever the gospel shall be preached throughout the whole world, that also which this woman hath done shall be spoken of for a memorial of her'—may well be genuine, despite the adverse criticism of many commentators. But I venture to think that the method of dealing with the problem which I have indicated is more fruitful of true results than any appeal to isolated texts.

There is yet one particular feature of the Kingdom which may well be mentioned here. It is a social whole opened to all; but in its society there is diversity of rank. The old distinctions vanish, it is true—the glaring distinctions of high and low, rich and poor, which mark each present age. But there is no dead level in the time that is coming. There are 'first' and 'last'; it is possible for Jesus to speak of him 'that is but little in the kingdom of heaven'; the chief places on His right hand and His left are 'for them for whom it hath been prepared.' In the heavenly order, then, which is shortly to break in upon this world, there are degrees and stations. And to certain of these the apostles are in a very special sense appointed. 'Verily I say unto you, that ye which have followed me, in the regeneration when the Son of Man shall sit on the throne of his glory, ye also shall sit upon twelve thrones judging the twelve tribes of Israel' (Matt. xix. 28). Critics are more or less evenly divided as to the authenticity of these words, with the balance perhaps in their favour. If not genuine, the tradition of them must have sprung up early—that is, before the Church had passed over from Jewish to more Hellenistic ways of thinking. If, on the other hand, they were said by Jesus, we have a simple explanation of that high position of overseership and authority which was evidently given to the apostles in the primitive Church. And it will throw light on their eagerness to fill up the vacant place of Judas. These facts are not, of course, decisive; but they count for a good deal in a balance which, so far as concerns literary criticism alone, is evenly poised. And we shall not be wrong in supposing that the special and unique position given to the apostles in the early Church—a position

which could never have sprung from any form of popular choice, but was due to the belief in their Divine commission—does indeed represent a corresponding design in the mind of Christ.

Yet, as has been said, the distinction of places in the Kingdom was on the same plane as that which prevails upon earth. Nowhere more trenchantly than in this context does Jesus affirm the *transvaluation of values*. The kings of the Gentiles have lordship over their subjects, and win the title of 'Benefactor.' But this is not the kind of position which the disciples of Christ may covet or expect. They will not say to men 'Do this,' and require obedience; nor exact the praise of men for any large measures of legislation which have commended themselves as popular. No, rather their priority will be one of service; the highest rank they can aspire to is the rank which will involve the widest opportunities of helping others. Their authority will be that of sympathy, internally conditioned; not one of command, exercised from without. The ideal of the Christian ministry is here—the divine commission and the inner love of others; an ideal of which Jesus Himself was the supreme exemplar, who, though by divine commission He was the Son of Man, yet through His love of others came to minister and to give His life a ransom for many (Mark x. 42-5).[1] We shall recur at a later point in this book to this passage. Suffice it to say here that so far from importing into the context an alien idea, as some critics

[1] It will be noticed that we have here brought together three distinct passages—Matt. xix. 28, Mark x. 42-5, and Luke xxii. 25-30. The difference between Matthew and Luke is verbal only, but that between Mark and Luke is more. They have a common factor—the description of the authority of Gentile rulers and its Christian contrast: then Mark closes with the saying about the

maintain, it provides the motive and most striking instance of that principle of authority which Jesus said should find place in the Kingdom.

Son of Man ■■ ransom, Luke with the promise of the disciples' thrones. The difficulties of the non-Lucan part in Mark, and of the non-Marcan part in Luke, decrease, if we assign them to the same occasion. For, as suggested above, they reveal an inner connection of thought.

CHAPTER III

THE FAITH OF THE KINGDOM

In the course of the previous chapters two antinomies have emerged. The one lies in the fact that, while Jesus for the most part speaks of the Kingdom as future, there are certain passages where He speaks of it as though it were already present. The other has reference to the time of the coming of the Kingdom, which Jesus sometimes regards as immediate, sometimes as destined to be delayed. As to the first antinomy, we suggested in the text that it was verbal rather than real. Jesus, that is, spoke of the Kingdom as present only in the sense that He used the word to cover those persons who were already destined for the Kingdom, and those events wherein the powers of the Kingdom were already at work. He sees already around Him an anticipation of what is in itself future, and He uses the language which properly belongs to something future to express it.

The second antinomy we left unresolved. Yet, from one point of view, the key to this, as to the other, lies in the first circle of believers. In that they have repented and believed they have fore-dated the advent of the Kingdom. 'The kingdom of Heaven suffereth violence,' He says, 'and men of violence take it by force.'[1] But in that their repentance and faith are not sufficiently deep

[1] Matt. xi. 12. Many scholars think that the reference in this verse is to the reckless attempts made in Palestine to bring the

and constant or have not spread widely enough, the Kingdom is still deferred. The seed of His message must be sown broadcast, even though some fell by the wayside, and other on stony ground, and yet other among thorns; there was still the good soil waiting to be fertilised and to bring forth abundance of fruit. The harvest which whitened the fields must be gathered in to the full, even if tares were found mingled with the wheat. It was with this object that Jesus 'appointed twelve that they might be with him, and that he might send them forth to preach.' And if we ask the motive for this missionary work, it appears to be twofold. On the one hand, there is the compassion of Jesus, His love for men and for their salvation. 'But when he saw the multitudes, he was moved with compassion for them, because they were distressed and scattered, as sheep not having a shepherd.' He thirsts to call into activity all that is latent of spiritual life and character, and in view of the imminence of Judgment to save these brands from the burning. On the other hand, there is a theological motive as well. The measure of response to the Gospel rests indeed in part with God. It is those who have ears to hear who hear; high place in the Kingdom is 'for them for whom it hath been prepared.' But it is man's work to give to them the message; and until it is given and the elect have been called out from the world, the Kingdom

Kingdom of God by force, or to the treatment meted out so lately to its first herald, John the Baptist. Yet neither of these views does full justice to the context. The leading thought throughout is the place of the Baptist in the scheme of things. He is Elijah—that is, the prophet of whom Malachi had said that he should come before the Judgment to call the people to repentance. The violence displayed, then, since John's day is the violence of repentance, which is as it were wresting the Kingdom from God or storming its way into it.

tarries. Thus, at one time Christ's mission is so successful in eliciting faith and repentance that He sees the Kingdom as immediately about to arrive—nay, come already by anticipation for those who have responded. But at another He marvels at their unbelief, which dams the flow of the Kingdom's energies and seems to postpone to a far date its realisation. Those who have had ample opportunity of responding remain unmoved; those who have believed fall away. It is this oscillation in the spiritual state of His hearers that may be in part accountable for the two currents of thought in our Lord's teaching about the time of the advent of the Kingdom.[1]

It is not, moreover, for the Lord alone in the New Testament that repentance and faith react on the coming of the Kingdom. St. Peter, speaking at Jerusalem, urges his listeners to repent 'that so there may come seasons of refreshing from the presence of the Lord': [2] and in the second Epistle which goes by his name we find repentance and moral earnestness required of those who are 'looking for and *hastening* the coming of the day of the Lord.' [3] And in our own time this belief operates together with the love of men as a stirring motive of missionary endeavour. It is not so long since appeals for missions were based primarily upon the distressful condition of the heathen and the prospect of the awful doom which awaited them. To-day all that is

[1] It is important to observe that in the Parable of the Vinedresser the delay of the Judgment rests ultimately on the mercy and long-suffering of God, for which the 'vinedresser' intercedes (Luke xiii. 8, 9); cf. 2 Peter iii. 9.

[2] Acts iii. 19. We have in this notion the Christian version of the Rabbinic doctrine according to which the coming of God's Kingdom was conditioned by the righteousness of His people.

[3] 2 Peter iii. 12.

true in this appeal is coupled with the more rational and not less constraining truth, that the Church cannot be fully builded until all peoples have contributed their bricks. Where before we pleaded only for the heathen's sake, we plead now on behalf also of Christianity itself. One may question whether anything can so evoke the energies of the Church as the full realisation that these energies can hasten the Kingdom of God.

Finally, if this were our Lord's own conviction, it sheds much light on His resolve to go up to Jerusalem to die. For what fact could more surely unlock the springs of penitence in His people than the fact that the Son of Man, the appointed Messiah, could only enter into His glory at the cost of His own death? From their own Scriptures they would learn at once the bearing of His death upon their own repentance and hope of salvation. The wave of repentance caused by His preaching ebbed and flowed unevenly; the devils seemed only to be returning reinforced to the house He had swept and garnished. Only by such a crowning and arresting event as His death could He clinch the change of heart He had already elicited, and so enlarge and amplify its working that without further delay the time would be ripe for the Son of Man to inaugurate the Kingdom.

What we need to grasp, then, before proceeding further with this chapter is that the repentance and faith which Jesus strove to elicit should be regarded in a double relation; on the one hand, as leading men into that circle of believers which Jesus can speak of already as 'the Kingdom'; and, on the other, as conditioning by their compass and intensity the time when the Kingdom itself shall come. Hence it is time that our interest should now be transferred from the future Kingdom to this germinal Church. We want to know more about it,

and about the spirit which Jesus by His teaching inculcated upon it. What new features had they in their outlook besides the hope of the Kingdom? What was their relation to God and to Jesus Himself? What was the spirit which controlled their relations with one another? What organisation, if any, was given to them? It is the answers to these questions which will occupy us in this chapter and the next.

I

It is a commonplace to say that Jesus revealed God as 'Father.' This is taken by the 'Liberal' group of Protestant theologians to have constituted the burden of His teaching. For the most part their expositions of this doctrine display a singular unanimity both in what they assert and what they pass over in silence. And yet very few can find satisfaction in the truth to which they testify, despite this remarkable consensus of scholarship. And the reason is not far to seek. It lies in the sudden and secret irruption of the subjective element into discussions which purport to be objective and scientific. Not the true historical setting, but modern Unitarianism, is the context in which Christ's teaching about the Father is regarded. And the flaw spreads inevitably to the treatment of other elements in His message. The arresting paradoxes of the Sermon on the Mount, the uncompromising demands on individual purity of character, the claims for complete surrender of life, are whittled away into the ethics of citizenship and the principles of social service. And by consequence it follows that the more strict is the adhesion to the historical method in what is left, the more completely is the unity of Christ's teaching

—a unity which we have a right to look for in such a Teacher—shattered to pieces, and the seamless robe turned into a coat of many colours.

The particular case before us—the teaching of Jesus about God—affords a very striking example of how much error may be caused by a deviation, even for a space, from an historical treatment. True, the error is not one of substance so much as of proportion and balance; but the net result of it is none the less disastrous. If the 'Liberal' view of the teaching of Jesus were true, we should expect the evangelists to tell us that He went about Galilee preaching and teaching that God is the Father of all men. Yet such a result is given neither by the general impression nor by the details of our Gospels. If it is to be found anywhere, it is in the writings of the Stoics. What do we find instead? 'Jesus came into Galilee, preaching the gospel of God, and saying, The time is fulfilled, and the kingdom of God is at hand: repent ye, and believe in the gospel.' Soon He gathers round Him a body of believers, who accept His message, either from His own lips or from those of His chosen disciples; and it is in the circle thus formed that He speaks of God as Father. That is the first point to be observed: *the teaching of Jesus about the Father, where it is direct and not parabolic,*[1] *is given to those who have already responded to His preaching.* It is unhistorical, therefore, to use language which implies that the truth of the Divine Fatherhood formed part of Christ's public mission. The Sermon on the Mount, we are told, was uttered after 'his disciples came unto him.'

[1] This qualification is needed to cover such cases as the parable of the Prodigal Son. Where Jesus speaks of the Father directly in the Synoptic record, it is *without exception* (so far as I can discover) to His own followers.

And the second point to be observed is this. Even within this circle of believers Jesus does not proclaim that God is Father. That is not the form His message takes. We should be nearer the truth in saying that *He assumes that they recognise God as Father*. He speaks of 'my Father' and 'your Father' quite naturally; and the attributes which He ascribes to Him are not analytic —not, that is, such as are involved of necessity in the conception 'Father'—but are traditional attributes of God in the Old Testament. That He is the Lord of heaven and earth, that He is of infinite holiness,[1] that He is surrounded in Heaven by angels and patriarchs,[2] that He sustains nature and nourishes life,[3] that He is omnipotent[4] and omniscient,[5] and disposes the issues of history,[6] that it is He who reveals truth[7]—all these attributes of God were well known to psalmist and prophet of old. In these respects Jesus was but developing the Old Testament conception of Jehovah. What is of startling and original moment is that He can speak commonly and characteristically of God as 'my Father' and 'your Father.' The bearing of this upon His own Person will be dealt with in another chapter. The point to grasp for the moment is that, by their inclusion in the number of believers in His message of the Kingdom, His followers had entered a *milieu* in which it was natural for them, as for Him, to regard God as 'Father.' Or, in the words of a modern theologian, 'the distinctive factor in Christianity is not that He taught that God

[1] Matt. xi. 25; Matt. vi. 9; Mark x. 18.
[2] Matt. v. 8, xviii. 10; Mark xii. 27; Luke xii. 8.
[3] Matt. v. 25; Luke xii. 24, 27.
[4] Mark x. 27, xii. 24; Matt. x. 28.
[5] Matt. vi. 4; Mark xiii. 32; Luke xvi. 15.
[6] Matt. xviii. 7; Mark xii. 1 f. [7] Matt. xi. 25, xvi. 17.

was the Father of men, but that God was *His* Father; . . . He was the Son of God in order to bring men into sonship, by enabling them to lay hold of the redeeming love of the Father.' [1]

Further, if we put these two views to the test of the religion of the primitive Church, there can be no question as to which accounts best for the facts. There is no sign that the burden of the early preaching was the Fatherhood of God; in isolation, indeed, that would have been no novelty to the Graeco-Roman world. The centre of their public message was Christ, and He crucified. Then when they had won men to the allegiance of Christ, who had died and was now alive in their midst, they could speak of God as their Father. The converts could voice their new spiritual experience, not only in the phrase 'in Christ,' but equally by saying that they had received the spirit of adoption, whereby they cried 'Abba, Father.' The first and primary fact was relationship to Christ in and through His Church; and it was thence by implication that they came to that knowledge of God which finds utterance in the word 'Father.'

What was involved in this appellation of God? First, let us notice that it was no invention of Jesus. To all Israelites, as by right of birth, God was Father, though His Fatherhood is national rather than individual. But the belief in God as Father of each Israelite comes to full expression in the sayings of the Jewish scribes. 'Be bold as a leopard,' says one rabbi, 'and swift as an eagle, and fleet as a hart, and strong as a lion, to do the will of thy Father which is in heaven.' It was, then, traditional as an appellation of God in the time of Jesus, whether widespread or not. But Jesus

[1] *The Theology of the Gospels*, by Dr. James Moffatt, p. 99.

gives it a cardinal and salient place in His teaching about God. And the explanation of this lies in the way in which it is introduced—that is, as we have already seen, not by direct assertion, but by natural and spontaneous allusion. He does not labour to show His hearers that God is their Father; He takes it as proved, because experienced. Nor is this hard to understand, if we may regard His own knowledge of God as starting-point. We cannot certainly distinguish those passages where Jesus speaks of God as 'the Father' from those where His phrase is 'my Father'; because in the original Aramaic these two coalesce into one and the same word, 'Abba.' But in either case what is implied is a relation of the deepest intimacy with God. That was the practical import of the appellation on the lips of the Jewish teachers and in the pages of their writers. It presented itself to Jesus, therefore, as the best medium of His own knowledge of God, and of that revelation of God which He passed on to all His circle of believers.

An interesting illustration of this significance of the term 'Father' on our Lord's lips comes from the eighth chapter of the Fourth Gospel. We have there a record of a controversy between Jesus and the Jewish leaders, in which the Lord contends that they have no right to speak of God as their Father. 'If God were your Father,' He says, 'ye would love me: for I came forth and am come from God; for neither have I come of myself, but he sent me.'[1] Not only, then, does He think of God as Father of Himself and of all who follow Him; He denies the right to use this appellation of God to those who reject His appeal. Even if this passage be much coloured by the Jewish controversy in which the Fourth

[1] John viii. 42.

Evangelist was engaged, it was written by one who was deeply imbued with the Master's spirit, and was expressing the spirit of the Church ; and it could never have been written if Jesus had taught that God's Fatherhood was a truth independent of the believer's relation to Himself.

We may sum up this discussion, then, by saying that what is new in the teaching of Jesus about God is not any abstract assertion of His universal Fatherhood, but lies in the fact that He rendered God intensely concrete and real for all His followers. The universalism is indeed there ; for the Father is the Creator, who sends the rain upon the just and the unjust alike, and welcomes to His Kingdom all those, of whatever age or clime, who have served men in their generation. But that is not where the stress lies. In truth, the actual point of stress is hidden, because it is assumed. But the fact that Jesus speaks of the Father only when He is speaking to the disciples, and the fact that the earliest Christians were conscious of a new spirit of sonship, indicate where the point was. It lay in the fact that they followed and believed in Jesus ; so that He was able to communicate to them something of that intimacy of relation which subsisted between Him and God. The instinct which made the Church move baptism back to the days of infancy was a true one. For now, as when Jesus taught His disciples in the flesh, God's Fatherhood is learnt better from fellowship with Christ in His body than from any direct and isolated statement of the truth. We understand, as they did, our Lord's allusions to the Father ; for it is in the Church that we have found God as concrete.

It must not be thought that because Jesus does not enunciate the abstract truth that God is the Father of

all men, but rather assumes that those who believe on Him already realise it in the concrete, that He did not give any new teaching about God. Much indeed, as we have seen, of what He taught of God had been taught before Him by psalmist and prophet; but there were two or three particular respects in which His words came as a new and liberating message. The first was in His strong insistence upon God's hunger to forgive. Ever since the Captivity the Jews had tended more and more to think of God as a severe taskmaster, who would exact every whit of legal obedience; and the tenderer teaching of certain rabbis and apocalyptic writers had had little effect in rendering Him more approachable to men. But Jesus brought a new hope. God was eager to forgive; there was more joy in Heaven over one sinner who repented than over ninety-nine just persons who needed no repentance. And so in the parable of the Prodigal Son, who 'arose and came to his father, . . . while he was yet afar off, his father saw him, and was moved with compassion, and ran, and fell on his neck and kissed him. And the son said unto him, Father, I have sinned against heaven, and in thy sight: I am no more worthy to be called thy son. But the father said to his servants, Bring forth quickly the best robe, and put it on him . . . and let us eat and make merry: for this my son was dead and is alive again; he was lost, and is found.' It is difficult to know whether we should observe here first the father's passion to forgive or the penitence of the son. For the second must not be minimised. This parable in no way compromises the justice of God. The sin is not condoned, but forgiven; for the forgiveness is conditioned by the son's genuine repentance. There can be no salt nor discipline in a religion

which will emphasise the mercy of God without at the same time pointing to the real change of life's direction which conditions its exercise towards the sinner.

Yet, further, Jesus insists always that, to win God's forgiveness men must be not only by penitence forgivable, but also themselves forgiving to their neighbours. He throws this into most vivid expression in the parable of the Unmerciful Servant; who, when his master has forgiven him, even forfeits the mercy he has won, by an exacting churlishness towards his fellow-servants. Jesus teaches that our capacity for being forgiven varies in exact ratio with our capacity for forgiving our neighbours. Readers of *Ecce Homo* will remember the predominating stress which is laid upon this aspect of the teaching of our Lord.

Again, there is a passage recorded for us only by St. Luke,[1] which seems to be a direct criticism upon what is still a popular error. Some people had told our Lord of a singularly disgusting outrage perpetrated by Pontius Pilate, when he killed in the courts of the temple some Galileans who had been offering sacrifice. The way in which they reported the incident must have disclosed a lurking belief that this apparently unmerited suffering was in reality God's punishment for some sin. Jesus rounds upon His self-righteous informants with a warning that worse things than that await them, unless they repent; and in passing denies outright the notion of God's dealings which underlay their thoughts. The problem of undeserved suffering, whether at the hands of men or of chance, on which Christ here touches, is as old as religion. Its classical expression is in the Book of Job; and we have our Lord's word for it that the facile

[1] Luke xiii. 1-5.

solution of Job's comforters, who would refer it to the sufferer's sin, is not the true one. From time to time, when thousands are killed by some great earthquake, or hundreds drowned in a disaster at sea, this old error rears its head in the public press or pulpit. But it is not a doctrine of Christianity. The Church can offer no authoritative answer to the questions such calamities raise; it can only say that Chance is a factor in this life which has to be recognised, and that we must learn what we can from its operations.

Another liberating element in our Lord's revelation of God is that He desires for men life and growth. Much of His teaching can be epitomised in the words: 'I came that they may have life, and may have it abundantly.' Nowhere perhaps is the claim for rich and fruitful activity put more clearly than in the parable of the Pounds. It is one of those passages which seem intended to make provision for delay in the coming of the Kingdom. The lord goes into 'a far country'; and there is time during his absence for a most profitable use of all he has bestowed. But the chief lesson of the parable lies in man's duty to use his gifts, whereby in benefiting others he will also increase his own capacity for well-doing. An ample justification for Christian civilisation is to be found here. The talents with which man is endowed—his æsthetic and intellectual instincts, as well as his moral—are meant to be brought to fulfilment, and not stunted in the supposed interests of a puritanical religion. For God who gave them requires them of us, and wills that they shall bear fruit. It is indeed by our fruits that we shall be known. Bad fruit or none at all argues a corrupt tree; and no profession of religion will avail to prevent its ultimate perishing. God is a God of Judgment, but not

'austere': it is His will that none of His little ones should perish. May we not say that for Jesus the abuse of men's powers and faculties is a less grave evil than their atrophy? And this is of great importance for our understanding of His revelation of God. It sets Christianity as a dynamic religion in sharp contrast with such religions as Buddhism, where the endowments of life are thought to be evil, so that human effort should be devoted to escaping from them. For the Buddhist, and even for the Hindu, all movement is useless; for at the end we are reabsorbed into the Spirit whence we came. Christianity, on the other hand, by its doctrine of God, is pledged to the reality and value of change and growth, and has grounds for its faith that

There can never be one lost good.

II

This inner bond which unites men to Jesus, and through Him to the Father, is what we mean by faith. It is to be noticed that faith has a somewhat different significance in the Fourth Gospel from that which it bears in the Synoptic record. St. John wrote that we might believe that Jesus was the Son of God; and in his account of our Lord's teaching faith commonly has this reference.[1] But this developed usage is not to be found in the Synoptic Gospels. There faith is much more indeterminate; it is practical trust in, and adherence to, Jesus rather than belief that Jesus is Christ. The distinction is well seen in relation to the miracles of Jesus, which are the commonest context of the use of the word faith in the Synoptic Gospels. The inference which

[1] John iii. 16 f., x. 37, xii. 36, xiv. 11, 12.

Jesus expects His followers to draw from His miracles is not that He is the Messiah, but that the Kingdom is close at hand, and its energies already stirring. The miracles are 'works of power' or 'powers.' The Fourth Evangelist, on the other hand, gives an apologetic and theological significance to Christ's miracles, just as he had charged the word 'faith' with a confessional content. They are 'signs' of His divinity, or 'works' which spring from and attest the Godhead dwelling in Him. In face of such a discrepancy we shall probably not be mistaken in regarding the Johannine sense of the word faith as a later, though perfectly natural and legitimate, development of the original, and in confining ourselves for an account of its authentic usage to the Synoptists. It is, of course, credible enough, apart from more general difficulties of history, that if our Lord disputed with theological Jews, He should have given to faith and miracle a theological colour. But in the present state of criticism we do not wish to rely upon this. In both accounts, too, be it observed, the faith which Jesus seeks issues in practical adhesion to Himself.

Let us inquire, therefore, in somewhat greater detail into what Jesus means by faith, in the Synoptic record. In nearly every case where 'faith' or its cognates occurs on our Lord's lips in the Synoptic Gospels, it occurs, as we have already pointed out, in connection with miracles. Faith enables Jesus to bring into play supernatural powers; and whether works of healing or acts of forgiveness be in question, or whatsoever it be, faith appears as their indispensable condition. It is faith which makes soul or body whole. Thus to the woman, who in the Pharisee's house 'began to wet his feet with her tears,

and wiped them with the hair of her head,' Jesus said, as He bade her farewell, 'Thy faith hath saved thee'; and likewise she who had the issue of blood is said to have been cured by her faith. Moreover, the faith which conditions these exercises of power need not be the faith of the sufferer in person; it is the centurion's faith which saves his boy, Jairus's which avails for his daughter. On the other hand, if this faith be absent, nothing can be done, not even by the Lord Himself. The upshot, then, is that faith is commonly used by our Lord of that confident expectancy towards Him, which enables Him to restore both the souls and the bodies of men.

Jesus taught that the exercise of abnormal power was in the reach of all, if only they had sufficient faith in God. But in effect we find in the Gospel narrative that it is nearly always Jesus Himself whose power is thus called into activity; the miracles which faith enables are wrought at His hands. We may not perhaps go so far as some readers of the Gospels, who interpret faith as faith in Jesus as divine. But certainly it is faith in Jesus that is required. He speaks of His followers as them 'that believe on me.' Such a claim must have appeared well-nigh blasphemous to an orthodox Jew. Moreover, the issue of it was not only the cure of bodily sickness; it was also the forgiveness of sins, and this was conceived to lie in the prerogative of God alone. So that the faith which binds Jesus and His followers was without ambiguity a faith in Himself as exercising divine authority and wielding divine powers. We cannot indeed read the Gospel of St. Mark without finding this impression strengthened on every page.

Further, the Lord Himself does give to His mighty

works a theological import, though it is not clothed in modern theological language. He sees in them the powers of the supernatural kingdom of God, its advance guard, as it were, which has taken men by surprise. It is probable, indeed, that He openly contrasted His own success in exorcising with the failure of others.[1] But in any case, here, mediated through Him and conditioned by faith in Him, were new and divine energies at work. And between this view of His miracles and the Johannine the difference is little more than what is involved by translation from one set of thought-forms to another.

In passing, it may be well to say a few words about the attitude of our Lord to disease. The very fact that He does not distinguish its cause from that of demoniacal

[1] Matt. xii. 28. 'But if I by the spirit of God cast out devils, then is the Kingdom of God come upon you.' The argument here is not easy. For, if Christ's exorcisms betokened the approach of the kingdom, why did not those of the Jews? I would venture to suggest that the solution lies in the different success which accompanied His and theirs respectively. His were successful—*i.e.* by the spirit or finger of God, which moves triumphantly. Theirs were not. This involves reading His question as: 'by whom are your sons *trying to* cast them out?' But such a use of the present tense can be supported from classical Greek, and it would fit in with what the Talmud reveals to us as the probable state of affairs at the time. The Jewish scholar, Mr. Abrahams, tells me that, while the Babylonian Talmud has a developed demonology at this time, there is very little about demons or the way to exorcise them in the Palestinian Talmud; though Josephus describes a method of exorcism which he had personally seen in Palestine. Mr. Abrahams suggests that the lifetime of Jesus was probably a period of transition in this respect, when the practice of exorcism was coming in from the East, and was a subject of discussion among the Jews. This would explain their attitude towards our Lord's exorcisms, and is readily compatible with the view that their own attempts to exorcise were frequently failures.

possession, but attributes them both to a Satanic origin, shows the light in which He regarded it. Disease for Him belongs to the sphere of things evil, and as such is to be fought and exterminated. Accordingly, we find that His own attitude towards it is uniformly one of combat. Yet it is very easy to go too far along this line: for the cure of disease is by no means a leading interest of His ministry. It is a by-product of it, and one which He does not wish to loom too large. In the great number of cases where St. Mark records a cure, he also adds either that the Lord enjoined silence, or that He went away to some other place. The reason is clear: not merely that He shrank from the possibility of being recognised as Messiah; but that He did not wish any exaggeration of what was secondary in His mission to catch hold of the public mind. For He had a more instant task than that of healing the sick, which would be inevitably hindered if He let His reputation as a healer grow too widely; and that was the preaching of repentance and of the Kingdom of God. 'Rejoice not,' He said, 'that the spirits are subject unto you; but rejoice that your names are written in heaven.'[1]

And such a balance of duties is what alone can enable the Church to deal with all the facts of human life. We are right to set great store upon the arts of medicine and surgical science, which have done so much by patient and faithful research towards the alleviation of suffering. We have perhaps much to learn from those who believe that faith can still work the miracles of healing which our

[1] Luke x. 20. I owe much of the above paragraph to an article by Prof. Burkitt in the *American Journal of Theology*, vol. xv., April 1911. Note, too, how in the cure of the palsied man in Mark ii. 1-12 the physical cure is only wrought as a confirming token of the spiritual.

Lord promised to it, and of which the Church has so often been the witness; though now this activity is principally to be found outside her borders. Yet still there remains the fact of disease which is apparently incurable, and pain which cannot be assuaged. To those who are in such case Christianity has always come as a message of life. For it sets the Kingdom of God before all sufferers as the focus of their interest; it asserts that what is of true significance for us here is the health of the spirit rather than of the body; and it redresses evils, which may not admit of banishment, by the consolations of imperishable hope.

But faith is not only to be set upon Jesus. He teaches His followers also to have faith in God. He strives to communicate to them something of that unimpeded trust in God, the sustainer of all nature, which was the basis of His own life. Just as He wished them to share His faith in God as transcendent and soon to set up His Kingdom on earth, even to the point of seeing its energies already present in His own mighty works, so, too, He claimed that they should share his unclouded faith in God as immanent, and derive thence the *insouciance* of all created things. Hence one of the most signal features about the faith which Jesus seeks is its conquest of anxiety.

Those who believe in God as the sustainer and nourisher of all natural life cannot be so faithless as to be worried about their own food or clothing. 'Consider the lilies of the field, how they grow; they toil not, neither do they spin; yet I say unto you, that even Solomon in all his glory was not arrayed like one of these. But if God doth so clothe the grass of the field, which to-day is, and to-morrow is cast into the oven, shall he not much

more clothe you, O ye of little faith?'[1] Well might Carlyle describe these words as 'a glance . . . into the deepest deep of beauty'; and indeed the whole chapter from which they are taken is one of unsurpassable eloquence. We need have no fear for the needs of the morrow; the morrow is best left to itself. One thing, and one only, should exercise us with regard to the future, namely, that we should seek the Kingdom of God. Those who are bent on this quest will be given the full equivalent of all that the world seeks after; they need not be anxious; for it is God's good pleasure that the Kingdom should be theirs.[2]

'The great cure for worry,' as a modern psychologist[3] has told us, 'is religious faith.' That is what Christ is thinking of here. We cannot suppose, and indeed other sayings of Jesus forbid us to suppose, that He meant to set a low value upon the qualities of prudence and foresight. What He essays to remedy is anxiety, worry, accidie, the lack of interior peace. That irritation can only arise because the mind is not preoccupied with any purpose which is above the changes and chances of this mortal life. The heart has to be set upon things which are not of this world before it can adjust itself predominatingly and victoriously to the things which are in this world: if it is to find richness and value in human life, it is because it has imported them from that which is outside its limits.[4]

To recapitulate, then. The faith which Jesus strove

[1] Luke xii. 27, 28.

[2] Luke xii. 22-32.

[3] Prof. William James in his *Talks to Teachers*.

[4] The above paragraph carries with it a corollary, viz. the Church, which preaches His gospel to the poor, imposes on itself the duty of removing, so far as possible, the causes of destitution.

to elicit in His disciples is, on the one hand, a relation of practical adherence to Himself, and of confident belief that He can restore those who believe, both in body and soul. On the other hand, it is directed also toward God, both as able to do whatsoever men ask of Him, and as the unfailing nourisher of the lives of all who trust in Him. It is the bond which links men to Himself, and through Himself to God. We can see from the Gospels that it is no constant activity among His followers. He marvels at their unbelief; He asks half despairingly whether, when the Son of Man comes, He will find faith on the earth.[1] And yet it is not as though it were without fruit. Already all who believe have found that their faith has set moving the energies of the Kingdom. There is no limit to its capacities, if men will but put them to the test. It can hasten the Kingdom itself.

And its great weapon towards this end is Prayer. In a parable, which St. Luke only records, Jesus sets forth the true object and the spirit of prayer. 'There was in a city a judge, which feared not God, and regarded not man: and there was a widow in that city; and she came oft unto him, saying, Avenge me of mine adversary. And he would not for a while: but afterward he said within himself, Though I fear not God, nor regard man; yet because this widow troubleth me, I will avenge her, lest she wear me out by her continual coming.' And He added, 'Hear what the unrighteous judge saith. And shall not God avenge his elect, which cry to him day and night, and he is longsuffering over them?' The object of the Christian's prayer is here clearly indicated as the Judgment, which should usher in the Kingdom for the elect. By praying for it, they can

[1] Luke xviii. 8.

hasten its coming. And the same petition has a central place in the prayer which our Lord gave to His disciples as a model. It is pervaded by the thought of the Kingdom. Addressing God as Father, they are to pray that His name may be hallowed. Holiness is a common attribute of God's name in the Old Testament, and it is sometimes connected with the coming of the Kingdom; for there His revelation of Himself will meet with due response of men's worship and homage. So there follows at once the petition 'Thy kingdom come,' which in the First Gospel is expanded by the interpretation, 'Thy will be done'; and these three foundation pillars of the prayer are crowned with the closing phrase, 'As in heaven, so on earth.'[1] Thus in the first half of the prayer the great vision of God's purposes for the world is set before them, and Christ calls His followers to no less a task than to hastening their consummation by prayer. Then only, when they have attuned their whole spirit to the compass of God's great design, may they come to pray for themselves on their earthly pilgrimage. So they go on to ask for two things without which they cannot live or work aright—namely, physical sustenance for each day, as it comes, and peace with God, through the forgiveness which He offers only to those who are themselves forgiving. And, finally, they conclude the prayer with the supplication that they may be saved from falling, whether through outward trial and temptation, or through the inward corruption of the heart. It is possible that in these last words our Lord had in mind the testing to which His disciples would be put in

[1] These words probably refer to all three previous petitions. Cf. the admonition on this subject contained in the Catechism put forth by the Council of Trent.

the troubles accompanying the end of the age.[1] But in any case, we can see very plainly from the Lord's Prayer what mighty influence Jesus attributed to this activity in hastening the coming of the Kingdom.

Such being the case, it is only natural that one of the first things required by Jesus of His disciples' prayer is that it should be importunate. This is indeed the proper lesson of the parable of the Unjust Judge, as it is also of the parable of the Friend at Midnight, who 'because of his importunity' secures what he goes to beg for. Importunate prayer cannot be gainsaid. 'Ask, and it shall be given you; seek, and ye shall find; and to him that knocketh it shall be opened.' For such prayer is born of faith; and He taught that whatsoever was asked for in faith should be received. Indeed, the faith here spoken of is not only a confident expectation; 'believe that ye *have received*,' He says; it anticipates the very possession of what it seeks.

We may note further those other features in our Lord's teaching about prayer, all of them duly recognised in the practice of the Church. First, He seems to have attached an especial value to corporate prayer. 'If two of you shall agree on earth as touching anything that they shall ask, it shall be done for them of my Father which is in heaven.' He requires that the spirit of one who prays shall be at peace with man as well as with God. We best learn to co-operate with the Father of all spirits through co-operating with the spirits of our brethren around us. Thus the instinct which has made the Church tireless in corporate worship and intercession is thoroughly true to the teaching of the Lord Himself.

[1] This is rendered probable by the parallel in Mark xiv. 38 (Gethsemane).

This will not minimise the value of individual prayer ; [1] Jesus Himself often went away to be alone, that He might pray ; but He reminds us, too, to be grateful to those who in monastic houses ensure that the breath of prayer shall not cease day nor night to rise to the throne of God.

Secondly, our Lord gave one injunction as to the method of prayer which is of great value. 'In praying use not vain repetitions, as the Gentiles do : for they think that they shall be heard for their much speaking.' Such an approach to God would imply that He is like some Oriental monarch who can only learn what his suppliant desires after he has heard it repeated several times ; then it may filter into his mind. Christ bids us come with the assurance that God knows our needs, and only waits that we should ask for their satisfaction. He thus discourages all excitability or sensationalism in prayer. The Christian's prayer will be slowly and thoughtfully uttered ; and, as in the Lord's Prayer, will express that true proportion and balance of God's designs and our needs which characterises those who look for the coming of the kingdom of God. It is this which distinguishes spiritual prayer from that psychic counterfeit of it, which rises so easily, and often even irreverently, to the lips. The Church has enshrined this principle of discipline in prayer in the dignity of its liturgical worship. Yet we may wonder whether it has made quite adequate use, at least in England, of intervals of silence in its services. This is probably one of those places where a permanent religious value has been con-

[1] Nor does it run counter to the command about praying 'in secret' in Matt. vi. 5, 6. The antithesis to that is not social prayer, but ostentatious prayer.

served and handed down by such a body as the Society of Friends.

And, thirdly, it is only in penitence that we can come to God. The proud isolation of the Pharisee wins no acceptance. The publican who cries, 'God be merciful to me a sinner,' goes down to his house justified rather than he. It is often said that Christianity teaches the equality of all men. Applied politically, this statement is a great exaggeration; Christ never suggests any desire to blink the manifold inequality of gifts and capacities with which different men are endowed. The only democracy He knows is one of equal standing before God—of equal value given to all on His part, and on ours, of equal unworthiness and guilt. The publican's appeal is the human counterpart of the first petition in the Lord's Prayer: the lips that confess God's holiness reveal themselves unhallowed. It is right, then, that our services should begin with confession of sin and with the plea of *Kyrie eleison*. In this the Church is only being true to the evangelic record.

The thought of penitence suggests, however, some positive ideal, which the followers of Christ acknowledge not having attained. Whence has that ideal come? When Jesus called men to repent, because the Kingdom of God was at hand, what was the new spirit and character which He evoked? What did He require of those who should hope to pass unscathed through the approaching Judgment? It is this question with which we will begin the ensuing chapter.

CHAPTER IV

THE SPIRIT AND FORM OF THE KINGDOM

I

It has often been noticed that Jesus had apparently far more care for those who habitually did wrong than for those who habitually did right. We can understand why He came 'to seek and to save that which was lost'—perhaps even why He 'came not to call the righteous, but sinners'; but it is not so easy to see at first sight why there should be 'joy in heaven over one sinner that repenteth, more than over ninety and nine righteous persons, which need no repentance.' Making all allowance for the paradoxical form of expression, is not this to set a premium upon sin?

Yet the difficulty is only on the surface. In one sense those who were truly righteous and devout did not need the special personal ministry of Jesus; they had spent their lives in 'waiting for the consolation of Israel,' and the whole bent of their characters would fit them to recognise it when it came. They were the subjects of the Beatitudes. Yet, looking deeper, in some at least of the sayings of Jesus about the 'righteous' and 'sinners' we can detect a strong vein of irony. The righteousness which is acceptable to God is not found in ninety-nine cases out of a hundred: what takes its place is a conventional counterfeit of that, and it is in contrast to this

that the repentance of one 'sinner' is so immeasurably a gladder thing. Christ looked to the possibilities of character, and all experience bears out His judgment that sin in its popular connotation—the sin which involves a measure of social reproach—is far less ruinous to real moral progress than the easy acquiescence in the standards of the world. And for Christians at any rate, it is far more lovable too. Most of us soon tire of hearing Aristides called just; but the story of Mary of Magdala never grows old. Virtue may well be the product of self-interest; genuine repentance cannot be. And Christianity would never have become the religion of Europe if it had been reserved for the respectable. It would have known no Francis, no Augustine.

Jesus, then, 'pointed the barb at the head of the lie,' and, whether in person or through His missionaries, summons men to a change of heart. Most briefly He sums up this change in the command to 'turn, and become as little children.' Much has been written about the sense in which our Lord meant these words. He was thinking of the innocence of childhood, or of its spontaneous trustfulness, or of its absence of care—such are some of the explanations advanced. All are perhaps partially true. But surely there is something more radical. Jesus means that those who wish to enter the Kingdom have got to begin all over again. The accretions of life, which for most of us become its motive—our interests, our prejudices, our conventional habits—these have to be laid aside. The traditions of secular civilisation, which bolster up a morality all their own, must be discarded for others of a different, higher polity. 'Except a man be born anew, he cannot see the kingdom of God.' There, in our Lord's conversation with Nico-

demus, is the true commentary on His charge to become as little children; and the Christian Church seals it in the Sacrament of Baptism.

It is in the Sermon on the Mount that Jesus sets forth all that is involved in the spiritual change He asks for. They make a great mistake who seek in these great chapters of St. Matthew a system of Christian morals. Christ gives us here no handbook of ethics such as has come from the pen of an Aristotle or a Mencius. There is no Christian ethic, but only a Christian spirit. Once we grasp this, we shall not exercise ourselves over discovering what in the Sermon on the Mount is novel and original, and what had been enunciated before. If parallels to its precepts be adduced from the teaching of Jewish rabbis or from Buddhist literature, this will only mean that human instincts of goodness have been the same the whole world over; and the whole world thereby gains. And, in fact, there is very little in the substance of the Sermon on the Mount which is exclusively Christian. Let us take one instance—Christ's teaching about forgiveness between man and man. In an apocalyptic book [1] which dates from about a century before the Christian era we read: 'Love ye one another from the heart; and if a man sin against thee, cast forth the poison of hate and speak peaceably to him, and in thy soul hold not guile; and if he confess and repent, forgive him. But if he deny it, do not get into a passion with him, lest catching the poison from thee he take to swearing, and so thou sin doubly. And though he deny it, and yet have a sense of shame when reproved, give over reproving him. For he who denieth may repent so as not again to worry thee; yea, he may also honour and be at

[1] Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs, Gad vi. 3-7.

peace with thee. But if he be shameless and persist in his wrong-doing, even so forgive him from the heart, and leave to God the avenging.' And there are countless other instances in which our Lord's ethical teaching has its counterpart in that of the Jews before Him. What is distinctive, then, in the Sermon on the Mount is not that it lays down a new ethic, but that it inculcates a new spirit. We are forced to question Lord Acton's statement (*quandoque bonus dormitat Homerus*) that: 'Christianity is a system of ethics to which a metaphysic has attached itself.'

And in what does this spirit consist? What are the marks of this change of heart elicited by Jesus? First—as is implied in the definition—its *inwardness* or sincerity. Christ penetrates to what underlay the letter of the law. So indeed had many of the rabbis before Him. He was not the first, for instance, to apply the seventh commandment to the lust of the heart as well as to the outward act. In these sharp antitheses—'it was said to them of old time . . . but I say unto you'—Jesus speaks as the rabbi. He puts the crown to that process of interpreting the Law and rendering it more inward, which was in effect—though the rabbis would not have admitted it—a criticism of its letter. He fulfilled the Law in bringing out its deepest meaning—a task to which many a Jew had devoted himself before; and, if He evoked their anger thereby, it was not merely because He seemed to overthrow the Mosaic ordinances; He showed them that in their own editing of it was involved the implicit confession of its inadequacy. There is nothing so distasteful to the orthodox as to be shown in its full revolutionary character the conclusion of their own premises. If the Law had indeed been pregnant

with the Spirit, then the time might surely come when the child should be born. Born it was when Jesus delivered it; and in St. Paul it reached the independence of maturity.

It was the true inwardness of the Law, then, which Jesus inculcated upon His disciples, when He bade them beware of anger as though it were murder, of impurity of heart as though it were adultery; when He showed them how reconciliation or parental duty far outweighed the punctilious performance of religious observances; how the *lex talionis* must make way for the law of love and meekness. And those who had already thus penetrated to the spirit and shown it forth in their lives He pronounced to be blessed. It is in the Beatitudes more than anywhere in the Gospels that we see the genius of the Christian spirit in contrast with the noblest of the world's ethics. There is scarcely one of them which could even have its correlative in a system of morals. Compare them with Aristotle's picture of the Great-souled Man, or with the cardinal virtues of Confucianism, and how vast is the chasm between them. For Jesus they depict the character which is fit for the Kingdom of God. There is no allusion in them to any special relationship to Himself save in the last. We need not suppose that He was thinking only of His own followers, though few of us can learn to attain their blessedness from any other source. We are at liberty to see in them the *anima naturaliter Christiana* of all ages and lands, whose possessors in their own right are entitled to the privileges of God's Kingdom. He thought of them, as well as of those who repented at His message, as members of His Church.

The Beatitudes have given rise to a common charge

against the Christian ethic of being eudæmonistic. To all of those whom Jesus calls blessed, giving them a value so little seen by the world, He attaches too a promise. To the humble belongs the Kingdom of Heaven, where they that mourn shall be comforted, they that hunger and thirst after righteousness shall be filled, and the pure in heart shall see God. Yet, if this be so, how can we acquit the Christian temper of being ultimately mercenary? Is it not a low form of teaching which incites men to goodness by the hope of a reward? Certainly, if the premise were here accurate, we should have to admit the conlusion. But in truth it is mistaken. The promise of reward in the Sermon on the Mount is attached to two different groups of sayings. In the first place, it is attached to the Beatitudes. But those are not moral precepts. Jesus is not in them enjoining men to do something; He is setting the seal of God's blessing to certain types of character. And consequently in the promise which follows each beatitude He does not offer a reward, but gives a reason why they are blessed. They are blessed because God will reward them. And in the second group the promise is attached to definite precepts. Give alms in secret, pray in secret, fast in secret—'and thy Father which seeth in secret shall recompense thee.' He does not say 'for' but 'and'; He states not a motive, but a result. And though indeed a result may operate as a motive, any moral loss so involved is swallowed up in the moral gain of the faith which alone can make it operative. And the end promised, too, is a spiritual end—the realisation of man's being in the eternal life of the Kingdom. Jesus never speaks as though men had no duty towards themselves; He tells us to love our neighbours *as ourselves*; He bids us use the

talents that we have; He sets the membership of the Kingdom before us as an end of such absorbing importance that for it, if necessary, even the simple dictates of humanity must take a second place. Those who speak as though Christ's teaching were concerned with making 'the ape and tiger die' are mistaken. He takes all the egoistic elements of human nature, and directs their driving force upon the quest of the Kingdom.

This expectancy is responsible for a second quality in the spirit to which Jesus calls His disciples—namely, its *zeal*. 'What I say unto you I say unto all, Watch.' And He reinforces His teaching with parables. He compares the disciple's duty to that of the porter, who must watch against the time of his master's return. He illustrates the difference between the watchful and the thoughtless spirit in the story of the Ten Virgins. They had gone out to meet the bridegroom, as he brought his bride home to his house. As they waited by the wayside they slept; until a cry arose that the nuptial procession was at hand in which they were to join. Then five of the virgins found that they were without oil in their lamps. It was too late then for them to repair the evil. When they returned from buying what was necessary the door of the bridegroom's house was shut, and they themselves were disowned. And the lesson is clear. The disciples must be ever on the watch, always alert. Moreover, if we thus interpret the parable as enjoining the intenseness of the Christian spirit, we underpin that fissure of controversy to which it gave rise in the Reformation period. Roman theologians contended that the oil which was lacking meant good works, Protestants that it was faith. The truth is that both are involved in any true interpretation of the

parable. Intensity of spirit, zeal, earnestness, whether in belief or act—this is what Jesus calls for in His disciples.

These considerations, we may observe, enable us to dismiss very briefly the frequent charge which is brought against the eschatological treatment of our Lord's life—namely, that it derogates the Sermon on the Mount to the level of 'Interimsethik.' If Jesus expected the Kingdom to come immediately, then His moral precepts were uttered merely *ad interim*, and had for Him no abiding or permanent significance. We are accused, in short, of eviscerating the Gospel of all moral content. The parable of the Ten Virgins suggests the answer to this objection. When Jesus commands His disciples to watch, He is obviously laying on them an injunction for an *interim*. But He is equally clearly attaching paramount importance to the way in which that *interim* is spent. And the reason is that it is bound in vital continuity with what follows it. And if the moral character of this connexion be duly stressed, the moral life of the *interim*—whether that be short or long—becomes manifestly of the first importance. It is true that misunderstanding may arise. Thus, at Thessalonica, as we gather from St. Paul's letter, the expectation of Christ's immediate coming caused some to be idle and disorderly. But that was because they had not fully learned how acceptance at Christ's hands, when He should come, was conditioned by men's conduct here. When that is grasped, as Jesus Himself taught it, a supreme value is set upon conduct; and this is in keeping with the fact that, in the history of the Church, the saints have one and all been such as looked for 'the Lord's appearing.' Furthermore, we have in this eschatological setting of Christ's moral teaching a ground of its universality, so

far as regards time. Its sanction is not the needs of this age or that; it is adapted to no temporal ends. The immediate goal of its direction is the final destiny of man and of the world; and therefore it can never grow old.[1]

Closely allied with the intensity[2] of the Christian spirit, both in motive and substance, is its *otherworldliness*. Christ demanded complete detachment from this world and its goods. If faith really lays hold upon the Kingdom, it will prompt the believer to any sacrifice for the sake of it. Whether the vision of the Kingdom is given to a man after long search, like pearls which a merchant has been seeking, or he meets with it unawares, like treasure trove, it is so compelling that he readily gives up for it everything he possesses. And Jesus brooked no compromise; the surrender must be absolute. 'No servant can serve two masters: for either he will hate the one, and love the other; or else he will hold to one, and despise the other. Ye cannot serve God and mammon.' Indeed, the renunciation seems to savour almost of inhumanity. 'If any man cometh unto me, and hateth not his own father, and mother, and wife, and children, and brethren, and sisters, yea and his own life also, he cannot be my disciple.' If eye or foot or hand offend, we must cast them from us rather than jeopardise the prize of eternal life. 'For whosoever would save his life shall lose it: and whosoever shall lose his life for my sake shall find it.'

[1] Not many years ago I heard the late Mr. Alfred Lyttelton, in a commemorative speech on a South African journalist, describe the intensity of his character; and he closed a very moving passage with the words: 'If he played with a child, he did it as though the end of the world were at hand.'

[2] Carlyle speaks of 'intensity' as 'the prevailing character of Dante's genius' (*Heroes and Hero-Worship*, chapter III.).

These poignant sayings have caused difficulty to many. Unless we are bound by religious vows, our life seems interwoven quite inevitably with Christian civilisation. We have a duty to it and in it; and unless its responsibilities are such as it would be wrong to repudiate, it is hard to see what stability it could have. How can it be right, in face of the sayings of Christ, for the Christian to marry or to build up a big business? An answer may perhaps be sought along the lines of distinguishing between the imitation and the following of Jesus. All are called to follow Him; only some are called to imitate. For all, the things of the spirit must be reckoned above the things of the world; and indeed these last can only have full value, so far as they are shot through with this gleam from the Beyond.[1] But of some more is required than this—or, perhaps we should say, something different: some are called to make themselves eunuchs for the Kingdom of Heaven's sake, to sell all that they have and give to the poor; and these are those who have given the Church its tradition of poverty and celibacy. One of the great values of this tradition at all times must be that it is a constant reminder to those whose task is to 'follow' that their life in the world may not be of the world.[2] We are falsifying what Christ asked if we bring it down to the level of a respectable civic life. It includes that; but it is infinitely more. It is that by accommodation for a time. What is essentially distinctive about the Christian spirit in the world is that it is detached—detached in a measure from life's goods

[1] See an admirable discussion of this question in Dr. Figgis's *Civilisation at the Cross-Roads*, chapter III. pp. 130-45.

[2] It is interesting to notice that Rudolf Eucken gives an important place to the ascetic life in his conception of Christianity.

as well as from its sins, and ready to forfeit them whensoever emergency requires. Business is not the pursuit of wealth, but the disposal of a trust; marriage is looked at not as the mother of comfort or pleasure, but as the school of chastity and the discipline of character. Regarded in this light, the positive ascetic practice, slight as it is, which the Church enjoins on its members, takes on a new significance. Many of the grounds alleged for it in the past have been dissipated by modern knowledge; we are inclined to give little heed to-day to the physiology of fasting. Yet this observance has an explicit sanction in Christ's teaching; and we can discern, surely, one clear justification for it, if it be to emphasise the note of detachment, and in so doing (as by paradox) to consecrate all meats. It is perhaps necessary, if we are to learn to follow Jesus rightly, that in one instance at least, however occasional, we should also imitate Him.

A word should be added as to the other way of cutting the ethical knot implied in Christian civilisation, of which special mention should be made; for it has been a permanent feature of the history of the Church, and is likely to be so no less in the future. I allude to the way of Monasticism. The difficulties involved are dealt with by being avoided. By forsaking the world, the Religious narrows down the sphere where civic duty rules life, and enormously increases that in which personal precept has weight and its literal fulfilment is possible. It is easy to accuse such a method of life as one that shirks responsibility. But it is much better to recognise frankly that the monastic vocation is a real one; that while most are called to 'follow' Jesus, there are a few who are called to 'imitate' Him; that while most must accept the world as it is, some have to re-create for

themselves in thought that environment and outlook which conditioned the form of our Lord's sayings. The monks of the Dark and Middle Ages adopted their way of life by natural reaction against the character of the age they lived in. With them society's evil was often its disorganisation. With us it tends to be just as much its over-organisation. And as the net of Church or State is drawn tighter, we may well suppose that the anti-clericalism or anti-socialism which results should increasingly find Christian expression for itself in the life of monk or friar.

There are two features in Christian asceticism which mark it off from kindred phenomena in other religions. In the first place, it is calculated, and not fanatical. It is deliberately thought out, a matter of the will and the intelligence, not of the religious passions. So Christ Himself taught, 'For which of you, desiring to build a tower, doth not first sit down and count the cost, whether he have wherewith to complete it? Lest haply, when he hath laid a foundation, and is not able to finish, all that behold begin to mock him, saying, This man began to build, and was not able to finish.' [1] And in the second place, its motive is positive, not negative. It does not spring from a pessimistic contempt of the world, but from the resolve to possess something better which belongs to another order. It is therefore ultimately optimistic. And the very assurance which it has of future possession gives it here and now the equivalent of all that is surrendered. The keynote of Christian asceticism lies in the words 'for my sake and the gospel's sake,' and it is

[1] Luke xiv. 28-30. So verses 31, 32. The pains which should be expended on the acquisition of spiritual blessing are paradoxically illustrated in the parable of the Unjust Steward—Luke xvi. 1-11.

from this positive motive, deliberately acted on, that it draws its unexampled attractiveness and power. Had more been made of it, we should probably have been spared much of Nietzsche's attack on the Christian ethic. His passionate appeal on behalf of the Beyond-man must awake some echo of response in all whose energies are bent primarily towards coming 'to the measure of the stature of the fulness of Christ': and it is because this positive, all-embracing human goal has on the whole stirred us so feebly that his writings break in upon the world with so much of the novelty and fire of prophecy.

And to these three qualities of the Christian temper—Sincerity, Intensity, Otherworldliness—must be added yet another, Love. Jesus described it in words addressed to a scribe, who had asked Him what was the first commandment of all. 'The first is, Hear, O Israel; the Lord our God, the Lord is one: and thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy mind, and with all thy strength. The second is this, Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself. There is none other commandment greater than these.' In the love to God are gathered all those specially religious activities—faith, prayer, almsgiving, fasting, and the like—with regard to which our Lord gave definite instruction; and of them we have already said something. Of the second commandment it still remains to speak.

Nowhere is the duty of love to neighbour more sovereignly illustrated than in the parable of the Good Samaritan. Thousands have drawn from it guidance and inspiration who would never make open profession of Christian belief. And the fact that the hero of the tale is one at whom the representatives of orthodoxy look

askance, and that they are blind to the dictates of a humanity to which he so readily responds, has confirmed many in the view that philanthropy rather than religion is Christ's first concern. The Social Gospel is taken as a sufficient title of what He had to teach. Yet, if there is any truth in the preceding chapters of this book, such a view travesties the facts. The criticism of contemporary Judaism implicitly contained in this parable is of a piece with the woes uttered upon the scribes and Pharisees in the twenty-third chapter of St. Matthew; and in neither is it our Lord's object to set philanthropy in contrast with religion as a superior claim upon man. Rather, He endeavours to recall religion to its true task of bringing forth fruits of mercy and kindness. The stress of our Lord's teaching is upon God and His supernatural Kingdom, where justice and mercy shall prevail. It is futile, then, to ransack the Gospels for sayings of Jesus which shall be taken as applying to the complex economic problems of our modern industrial life. On the only occasion when we are told that He was asked to settle an economic dispute, He refused to have anything to do with it. Instead, He took it as a text for a warning against covetousness. And this is typical of what has been and must always be the Church's attitude in times of social unrest. It is not her place to descend into the market-place where men are chaffering in schemes of social amelioration, and give to this one or to that her sanction. Such action could only be justified if Jesus was primarily the leader of a social movement against the economic injustices of His day:[1] but the whole tenour of His teaching runs counter to such an interpretation.

[1] Such is the view of Maurenbrecher in Germany.

On the other hand, it is of course true that certain elements of His teaching have a strong social bearing. The mere command to love one's neighbour as oneself —which is the half of a Christian's duty—guarantees it. He who lays it to heart cannot rest so long as he sees others living under conditions which clog that growth of the personality for which he expects room in his own case. The fact that some have more wealth than others in itself will not offend him; for men are differently constituted in regard to the scope and compass of their legitimate desires and to the cost of satisfying them. But he will not tolerate a social system which does not give to others the same chances of developing the best that is in them as he enjoys himself. The cry of equality he will dismiss as superficial, if it means equality of possessions. For it he will substitute the deeper and more relative conception of equality of opportunity; and to securing that he is bound to devote his energies, cost what it may. Further, the general character of this principle is itself a guarantee of progress. Conditions change with the lapse of time; and detailed commands which to-day might be valuable may be of no use to-morrow. But the broad duty of love to neighbour is universally valid, and Christ has left it to us to discover how it is to find expression and application in each succeeding age. Thus, St. Paul saw no harm in slavery; but the time came when the conscience of Christian civilisation found offence in it, and it was done away. To-day we in turn are finding offence in the existing distribution of wealth, which involves luxury and extravagance at one end of the economic system, and the cramping of life's energies at the other. On the modern economic organisation of society we have to bring our

principle to bear, and take it to guide us in our task of reconstruction. Our interest in social and political systems is not the less real because Jesus Himself did not advocate any. What He did do was to give us a criterion by which to judge them all; leaving it to us to advocate those which in our judgment shall most tend to give every one an equal chance of a full and fruitful life.

Much has been made in this connection of our Lord's teaching about poverty. But it is not there that we should turn for light on our social perplexities: it is rather to His teaching about riches. In both cases it is not poverty so much as the poor that He is concerned with; not riches so much as the rich. But it is to the rich, not the poor, that He looks for progress. The poor He takes as a fact, and blesses them; but to the rich He appeals for change. When He told the young man to sell all that he had and give to the poor, it was not for the sake of the poor so much as for that of the rich man himself. It is there that He brings home responsibility. For wealth is a danger to the life of the spirit. It is very difficult for a rich man to enter into the Kingdom of God.[1] And why? Because wealth tends to become an end in

[1] Mark x. 24, 25. The same lesson comes out clearly in the parable of the Great Supper (Luke xiv. 15-24), where the possession or new acquisition of property is alleged as an excuse for disobedience to the divine call. There is this element of truth, however, in the contentions of Maurenbrecher and his school, that Jesus, when He spoke of the poor, meant usually the actually poor, not merely the spiritually poor; and so, too, with the rich. Archbishop Trench, in commenting on the parable of the Great Supper, interprets 'the poor and maimed' in v. 21 as those who are so spiritually. It is very rarely that this great man errs; but this is just one of those cases where the historical 'realism' of modern criticism is almost certainly right; and Jesus is more probably thinking of the actual social unfortunates of His day. Cf. St. Paul at Corinth, 1 Cor. i. 26-8.

itself, and thus to obscure the only true and stable goal of life. 'The ground of a certain rich man brought forth plentifully: and he reasoned within himself, saying, What shall I do, because I have not where to bestow my fruits? And he said, This will I do: I will pull down my barns, and build greater; and there will I bestow all my corn and my goods. And I will say to my soul, Soul, thou hast much goods laid up for many years; take thine ease, eat, drink, and be merry. But God said unto him, Thou foolish one, this night is thy soul required of thee; and the things which thou hast prepared, whose shall they be? So is he that layeth up treasure for himself, and is not rich towards God.' [1] We could have no more trenchant criticism of that spirit of accumulation which has marked Western civilisation ever since the industrial revolution. And manifestly in this stress upon the character of riches as a trust and responsibility from God, the Church has a powerful fulcrum for reform. The blind and uncompromising insistence on the rights of property has nothing in common with the spirit of Jesus. He demands a less confident certainty, a greater elasticity—such is the mildest interpretation of His words; and when this is freely given, we are a long way on the road to a new and juster distribution of the means of life.

In the command to love one's neighbour as oneself Jesus found an extravagance of meaning to which previous teachers never carried the matter. 'Love your enemies, and pray for them that persecute you.' 'Resist not him that is evil: but whosoever smiteth thee on thy right cheek, turn to him the other also.' 'Whosoever would go to law with thee, and take away thy coat, let him have thy cloke also.' Indeed, so para-

[1] Luke xii. 16-21.

doxical is the character of these sayings that attempt is commonly made to whittle them down. It is urged that they enunciate a principle ; and it is implied that it is a principle which, in extreme cases, is to be honoured rather in the breach than in the observance. But the Christian saints are just those who, where opportunity offered, have taken these precepts literally. Many are the lights in which these sayings have been regarded. Tolstoi took the command to ' resist not him that is evil ' as definitely inculcating a doctrine of non-resistance to evil. Yet such a meaning is not in the words ; evil is not identical with him who does it. Another remarkable modern writer [1] sees in them ' the sublimest pride ' ; the Christian is above demeaning himself to a return blow, or boggling with an opponent over a coat. Yet this, too, would seem to be hardly a true account of the matter. But regard these precepts as proverbs illustrating the larger category of the love of neighbour, and they are patient of practical import. It is for the other's sake that we are not to resist. For our object is to show him his fault ; and if our imagination could but reach so far, we should believe that meekness—which has in it indeed a certain salt of pride [2]—was more effective to this end than any other method. It is not, needless to say, a fruit of cold calculation. It is the spontaneous rebound of a love to which violence is unnatural. Victor Hugo had caught the spirit truly, when he made the bishop in *Les Misérables* answer without a moment's delay to those who brought before him the thief and the stolen goods : ' I gave him them.'

[1] Chamberlain, *The Foundations of the Nineteenth Century.*

[2] Cf. Crashaw's phrase ' fiery humility.' No better exponent of the Christian spirit could be found than the Russian novelist, Dostoievsky.

And it is through insisting on the literal value of these sayings in their sphere rather than taking them as enunciating principles of universal validity that we avoid some of the pitfalls which beset their application. For instance, the second saying cited above about the man who tries by legal means to overreach his neighbour, the sweeping command to 'give to him that asketh of thee and from him that would borrow of thee turn not thou away,' the prohibition of swearing—all these seem to involve great difficulty for the modern Christian who is part of a complex social life. For these precepts no longer refer only to the dealings of individuals one with another, but have a bearing on society at large. As between individuals, meekness and forgiveness may be of supreme value; they may provide the surest way of overcoming evil with good and of shaming the sinner; though even then it must be made clear that the sufferer is forgiving, not condoning, is being meek, not weak. Few could say with safety what Christ said to the woman taken in adultery: 'Neither do I condemn thee; go in peace'; for only in a few is the flame of goodness so bright that none could misunderstand it. But the redemptive value of this attitude to wrong is clearly dependent upon directness of personal contact. Remove that, and you have a quite different situation. For action that between man and man might be charged with redemptive power becomes anarchical and disruptive when applied in general to society. If a man's wrong-doing affects not us only, but others—if, by refraining from prosecution, we may be leaving a dangerous criminal at large, is it not our duty to set in motion the forces of the law? If indiscriminate charity only increases the evils of beggary, can it be right to give

to them that ask of us ? Where falsehood is common, must we not do all we can to ensure truthfulness in suits where the vital issues of a man's life or reputation are at stake ? How, then, can Christ's commands be fulfilled ?

Now, first, we may observe that the difficulty which arises for us from the value of social stability and organisation is not one that would have presented itself in the same form to Jesus Himself. He was not concerned with the conditions of social security, seeing that He looked for the speedy coming of a new age, where life would be on a wholly different plane. For Jesus the important part of ethical conduct was its direct bearing upon individuals. The difficulty only exists for those who accept social institutions as a permanent fact of human life.

But does this mean that Christ's precepts have no valid application to modern life ? Are we, in the words of a recent writer,[1] 'involved in compromise'—a compromise, be it said, which virtually annuls what it compromises ? I confess that such a way of phrasing it seems to me somewhat dangerous, and that for two reasons. It heightens the intransigence of Christ's teaching ; and it minimises the extent to which its paradoxes can in fact be applied. Or, to put it differently, the precepts we are discussing are only specific determinations of the general principle, love to neighbour : this broad principle itself is really applicable, as it stands, to every aspect of civilisation ; while, on the other hand, these specific precepts have still a quite definite sphere of civilised life in which they may healthfully operate, even though it be not for most persons the whole. Let us take detailed examples. The broad

[1] Mr. William Temple, *The Kingdom of God.*

principle of love to neighbour may be regarded as finding its best social expression for all secular purposes in the civilised State. There the criminal is punished; institutions exist for dealing with the destitute, and legislation does what is possible to obviate the causes of destitution, while at the same time 'charity' is turned into useful channels; where national security—or the 'honour' which so often involves it—is at stake, war is undertaken. But the Christian will not be 'compromising' Christ's commands in giving adhesion to such a State. To him in his civic capacity the paradoxical precepts do not, and were not meant to, apply. Indeed, this division of the personal and the civic sides of life seems to have been expressly sanctioned by Jesus Himself, when He said: 'Render unto Cæsar the things that are Cæsar's, and unto God the things that are God's.' Christ's teaching provides, as it stands, ample guidance for the Christian in his social and civic life; and difficulty only arises when we try to apply to society precepts which were addressed to and meant for the individual.

This indirect and mediated relation of Christianity to the complex of systems which circumscribe the life of human society is even better exemplified and more necessary of application in international affairs than in those of domestic policy: for there the field is larger and history more impartial. Further, when we are dealing with the whole family of nations, it is possible to distinguish the *medium* through which Christianity operates It is what the Romans of old times called the *jus gentium*, or the collective conscience of mankind. Inevitably Christianity has played a great part in its upbuilding and development; but it is not to be confused with Christian principles. Indeed, it might perhaps be said

that this confusion, or the attempt to merge the two, has been one of the main causes of the apparent cruelty of official Christendom in days gone by. For, on the one hand, it is the precipitate of other spiritual influences besides that of Christ. In the first century of our era, Roman Law and Stoic Philosophy were busy nurses of it; while to-day it may fairly be claimed that considerable contributions have been made to it by the non-Christian Japanese. On the other hand, the employment of force is characteristic of it. Only so can it impose and maintain itself in a world where moral reversion is as common as moral progress. So that, when the Mediæval Papacy is excused for countenancing persecution on the plea that it was punishing political, not religious, offences, the answer is that it should never have been in a position to do so. Granting the major premise, its action was consistent; but the major premise was false, seeing that it involved an usurpation of the function of the general conscience of man by the Christian conscience, whose sphere of action was properly distinct.

This recognition of a spiritual force, operating in the civilised world, but independent of Christianity in itself, will assist in answering some of the questions which have been called into sharp prominence by the present war. Many of them bear traces of an excessive tenderness of conscience which bodes ill for the stability of Law and Right. And the repeated assertion that the fact of war betokens the relative failure of Christianity as a leavening force in civilisation shows a blindness to the sharp distinction between what the prophets promised and what Christ promised as to the Kingdom of God. The Kingdom of the prophets was indeed one with which war would be incompatible; for its clearest feature was

outward prosperity and peace, realised upon this earth. But this conception of the Kingdom was precisely what Christ would not accept. His Kingdom was 'not of this world,' as that of the prophets certainly was; and the blessing of material peace, like that of material prosperity, was not directly involved in the new age which He promised.

There is only one kind of war which our Lord seems expressly to have condemned—namely, war undertaken for the propagation of His religion. 'My kingdom is not of this world; if it were, then would my servants fight.' The reference is clearly limited to fighting for His cause. But He makes one incidental allusion to war, which, considered in its context, does much to illuminate the way in which He regarded it. Among the afflictions which He enumerates as preceding the final Judgment, Christ mentions 'wars and rumours of wars.' He thought of war, then, like famine or pestilence or earthquake, as an affliction. He does not, either here or anywhere else in the Gospels, speak of it as a sin; it is an affliction. As such, it is part of that 'evil' from which Christians pray to be delivered; and at the same time one of those disciplines from which much may be learnt. It is not a description of it with which any one would quarrel.

This attitude towards war does not dispense the Christian conscience from tracing back the origins of wars to sin. The prophetic doctrine, which interpreted calamities as direct interpositions of God in judgment upon sin, was in its bald form set aside by Jesus.[1] But He substituted for it a deeper truth. For His warnings about 'the signs of the times' mean that there were

[1] See above, p. 63.

already to be seen at work in society forces and tendencies which, unless arrested, must lead to ruinous issues. Thus, for Him, the destruction of Jerusalem would not come as an isolated *ab extra* judgment; it was inextricably involved in the pride and impenitence, the reliance upon prosperity and force, which marked the religious leaders of Judaism in His day. Christ's method, that is to say, was to recall men's minds to the moral causes of great calamities. He gave, in short, a fundamental emphasis to the fact of sin.

Yet the attribution of war to human sin does not carry with it the corollary that the Church must always resist war. For there are times when affliction must be voluntarily undergone to secure a good beyond it; and Christ never hesitated to ask His disciples to bear pain and suffering when it was necessary. Indeed, there is reason to think that He contemplated cases in which it would be the Christian's duty to fight. Speaking at the Last Supper, He said unto them, 'When I sent you forth without purse, and wallet, and shoes, lacked ye anything? And they said, Nothing. And he said unto them, But now, he that hath a purse, let him take it, and likewise a wallet: and he that hath none, let him sell his cloke and buy a sword.' [1] He contrasts two periods of activity; the first, which is now closing, when His disciples could expect a hospitable welcome and a kindly hearing; and a later one, now beginning, when these conditions would give place to days of violence and persecution and conflict; and He commands them to enter the lists armed like good warriors. It is not to be supposed [2] that He meant them to use the sword in personal self-defence or in their Master's defence; but rather

[1] Luke xxii. 35, 36. [2] Cf. John xviii. 36.

that they must not fail to play their part, when war became the order of the day. It is not a question of Christ, or of His Church, advocating war; for that would be to usurp the function of statesmen. But it is a question of endorsing war, and of strengthening the hands of those on whom the burden of decision or of execution rests. And there Christians must ask themselves on which side the '*jus gentium*' lies. Sometimes, as in the South African War, this will be far from clear; and then the Church will be divided. At others, as in the present case, there will seem no question about it; and then the Church will speak with single voice. The question at issue in the July of 1914 was whether or not there was to continue to be such a thing as the *jus gentium* on the earth; and seeing that that is the principal restraining force [1] upon the acquisitiveness of nations, the Church cannot but be interested in its maintenance.

That, indeed, is the criterion by which Christianity judges of any war; is it necessary for the vindication of the general conscience of mankind? For this conscience is a vital concern of the Christian Church. The hope, which is held out to men in the message of the Kingdom of God, of the ultimate unity of the human race must have its germs already existing here; and these are to be seen most clearly in the growing sense of International Right. Other things contribute to the growth of that sense besides Christianity—community of interest, the spread of education, facilities for cosmopolitan intercourse and travel; but, whatever the causes fostering its growth, it is something which Christianity pronounces good. It has, indeed, its dangers. The

[1] Cf. 2 Thess. ii. 7, 8, where 'the restrainer' is probably the Roman Empire.

pax Romana covered a multitude of sins ; and the torpor of the Chinese Empire for centuries attests the diseases attendant upon uniformity. But, if the full contribution of the several parts to the life of the whole is safeguarded (which it is one of the aims of Federalism, for instance, to achieve), the movement of the nations towards a World-State is in a direction which the Church must approve.

It is a doctrine of the militarist school that Christ's teaching about the love of neighbour applies only to personal, and not to political, relations ; and that therefore aggressive war is justifiable. The conclusion does not follow. For, though Christ does not rebuke aggressive war, He rebukes the spirit which produces it : and, further, it is contrary to that collective conscience which Christianity is concerned in fostering. It is in defence of this, rather than of itself, that Christendom takes up the sword against Germany ; just as it supports the police in the possible arrest of a criminal in civil life. But there is a further fallacy in the militarist contention. Christ's precepts do not apply to political relations ; but they apply *within* them. They inculcate a spirit in which all persons, carrying on whatever relations, should go to work. And even war has room for this spirit. It is possible for a soldier to fight the enemy, without hating him ; and the kindness which is often shown to prisoners or to wounded men on the battlefield is a fulfilment of the command to love one's neighbour as oneself. And this principle is valid in other spheres of life besides the soldier's. It is true, for instance, in that bloodless, but not less cruel, warfare of commercial competition which never begins nor ends, but is as old as man himself.

Christian citizenship, then, difficult as it is, is not a

hopeless enigma. Christ has left to it no legacy of specific precept; but the spirit of His teaching, and the few broad principles which He asserted, serve for sufficient illumination. Cæsar has claims as well as God—the conscience of mankind as well as that of the Church; and, though the latter has a prime place in educating the former, it is rather by unconscious filtering through generations of minds than by the deliberate exercise of influence with visible results. At least it is no less important to secure the progress which the general mind has made than to lead it on to higher stages which may endanger the ground already won. One way of doing this is fearlessly to endorse the general conscience, when it is driven to adopt the lesser of two evils; another is to exhibit within the contrarieties of ideal and fact the temper which Christ adumbrated in the Sermon on the Mount.

But when we turn from the civic to the personal life of the Christian citizen, we come to a sphere in which literal precept is to the point. He may not, for instance, sue a personal enemy save for the public good; his sense of justice must never oust his desire for the reclaiming of the offender. Our own prison system affords an illustration of the Christian method. The State punishes a criminal and puts him away, and in so doing does its duty by society. But it still leaves ample room for the activities of voluntary workers, who devote themselves to setting the criminal once more on his feet. And we may look forward to an extended application of these personal and reforming influences within prison life, while yet the law remains as impersonal and stern as ever. Or again, turn to the question of 'charity.' We are assured by all experts that indiscriminate giving does more harm than good, not to society only, but also

to the recipient. But that does not mean that the Christian's duty is fulfilled when he has been taxed for a poor law or a labour exchange. He can acquit himself of the personal duty to the beggar, involved in giving him time and trouble. If he does no more than put him in touch with a trustworthy institution, he has done something towards fulfilling the Lord's precept: 'Give to him that asketh of thee.'

No better illustration of my meaning could be found than in our Lord's prohibition of swearing. 'Swear not at all; neither by the heaven, for it is the throne of God; nor by the earth, for it is the footstool of his feet; nor by Jerusalem, for it is the city of the great king. Neither shalt thou swear by thy head, for thou canst not make one hair white or black. But let your speech be, Yea, yea; Nay, nay: and whatsoever is more than these is of the evil one.' The Law enjoined that the Israelite should swear by Jehovah's name, and be careful to keep his oath. Custom, it appears, had substituted periphrases for the name of Jehovah, and thought so to evade the full obligation of the oath. It was not so awful a matter to put oneself in the presence of heaven or earth —for that is the force of an adjuration—as in that of God Himself. But Jesus sweeps away this prevarication. In reality, an oath by heaven or earth is an oath by God; for He is present everywhere; so that all words are uttered in His presence, and an oath has no special significance. Not truthfulness on special occasions, but truthfulness always—a constant sincerity—is what Jesus demands. He sets out here not to belittle the binding character of an oath, but to mark the sanctity of all speech. The application of this principle in private life is sufficiently clear; but in public affairs it occasions

some difficulty. Does it, for instance, rule out the taking of an oath in a court of law as not permissible for a Christian? Surely not. For the Christian witness in court swears, not to ensure that he himself shall be truthful, but to 'profess openly that motive to truthfulness which rules all his speech.'[1] Civic duty requires that all witnesses should take oaths, since otherwise knaves would take advantage of society; and it becomes for the Christian part of his love to his neighbour. But equally his personal duty is to be always truthful; so that he will recognise no other kind of occasion when an oath is justifiable, while he gives even to the legal oath a different meaning from what it has in the eyes of the world.

There is one feature of Christ's teaching which deserves special notice before we conclude this part of the chapter, because it lies at the base of the Christian view of society and its true structure. I refer to His teaching about marriage. Endless controversies have of course raged both over the exact content and over the practical application of our Lord's sayings on the subject. His positive standard is clear enough. Quoting from the Pentateuch, He establishes the principle that man and wife 'are not two, but one flesh'; adding: 'What therefore God hath joined together, let not man put asunder.' It is over the negative implicates of the principle that difficulties arise. Yet even here they can be narrowed down within small compass. First, we may note that all Christ's recorded sayings on the matter contemplate the case of remarriage following separation.[2]

[1] The Bishop of Oxford's *The Sermon on the Mount*, p. 75. I am indebted to this book more than once in the present chapter.

[2] In Matt. v. 32 the remarriage is implied, though not stated, when He speaks of the man who puts away his wife 'making her

And taken together, the prohibitions are exceedingly comprehensive. A man commits adultery if he divorces his wife and marries another,[1] or if, being before unmarried, he marries a woman who has been divorced.[2] A woman commits adultery, if, having divorced her husband,[3] she marries another man. The matter is complicated, however, by the fact that, in both the sayings which the First Gospel records, the exception is added, 'save for the cause of fornication': from which it would seem that a man is allowed to divorce his wife for unfaithfulness. Yet, granting that this is what the exception means—and it is by no means certain [4]—it is very doubtful whether it can be a genuine utterance of Jesus. Working on the same canons as those which are applied to the rest of the New Testament, the bulk of critical opinion, whether liberal or conservative, as it is bound to do, pronounces against it.[5] And if appeal is made from the canons of criticism to the tradition of the Church, then it must be pointed out that the Church has always interpreted our Lord's teaching about divorce as though this exception did not exist.

an adulteress,' because he thereby drives her to a fresh marriage relation which is adulterous. The case contemplated is the second mentioned below, where we are to understand that both men are guilty.

[1] Matt. xix. 9; Mark x. 11; Luke xvi. 18.

[2] Matt. v. 32 (implied); Luke xvi. 18. [3] Mark x. 12.

[4] See Döllinger, *The First Age of the Church*, Appendix III.; H. P. Liddon, *University Sermons*, Series II., pp. 310-13 (referred to in Dr. Darwell Stone's *Divorce and Remarriage*: Pusey House Occasional Papers, No. 7).

[5] See especially Mr. Streeter in *Studies in the Synoptic Problem*, p. 222; and Dr. W. C. Allen, *ib.* p. 275. Dr. Sanday believes that some genuine utterance of our Lord must underlie the exception: see his evidence before the Royal Commission of Divorce and Matrimonial Causes.

When we have satisfied ourselves as to the content of Christ's teaching on this point, a further question presents itself. Was He, when He spoke about marriage and divorce, 'legislating' for the Church in a way admittedly unique? Or was He stating a principle or ideal, which the Church's law should aim at, but not necessarily embody? That is the alternative as it appears for the most part in modern controversy on the subject. Yet, put in that form, it is one that we shall do well to avoid. It is perfectly possible to answer the first question in the negative, without giving assent to the second. Historical considerations would certainly make us chary of allowing that in one case, and one only, our Lord dropped His usual method of stating broad principles of conduct, and laid down laws for His Church. But equally, if His words about marriage and divorce represent an ideal or standard rather than a law, it does not follow that the Church should feel itself entitled to adopt in practice a laxer legal application. Rather, the Church is the one social organism in the world where ideal and law can and must coincide. Over the great area of private religious life, this is obviously not practicable; but within the sphere of outward and public activity, Christ's standards become the Church's laws, and as such cannot be relaxed. The Church cannot bless what He declared accursed, save under pain of ceasing to be His Church.

Once more, great confusion has been introduced into discussion of the question through the tacit assumption that the Church's law must be binding also on the State. This is doubtless largely due to the habit of mind which has been fostered by the establishment of the Church in England. But properly there is no more reason for

the law of the Church, as such, being binding on the State than for that of the State being binding on the Church. As citizens, Christians may well insist that the Church's law of marriage is on grounds of reason more humane than any laxer one; in that the happiness of many marriages can only be secured at the cost of real effort, and that no incentive to effort could be stronger than the fact of indissolubility. But in the State, which is largely composed of those who are not Christians, it is only such natural grounds which can be properly alleged for a strict law of marriage. It is for the Church, not for the State, that Christ's standards as such have the force of law.

Finally, our Lord's teaching about marriage has its counterpart in His teaching about celibacy. The very passage in the first Gospel where He sets forth the ideal of marriage leads on directly to some words upon the celibate vocation. The disciples have said that, if marriage is so strictly hedged, it is better not to marry; to which the Lord answers that the unmarried estate is not for all, but for those only 'to whom it has been given.' And of these there are three classes, of which the last comprises those who 'have made themselves eunuchs for the kingdom of heaven's sake.' The upshot of the passage is to establish celibacy as a definite vocation; and that it was so interpreted in the early Church seems clear from St. Paul's words to the Corinthians. It should be observed that in our Lord's teaching there is no suggestion that celibacy is a higher estate than marriage, albeit it is more specialised; nor that it can be widely accepted as a general standard, though St. Paul seems to wish that it could be. But, on the other hand, both our Lord and St. Paul treat of mar-

riage and of celibacy together; both assign to celibacy the same justification—namely, the claims of the Kingdom of Heaven; and both assert that the two are separate callings. 'Howbeit each man hath his own gift from God, one after this manner, and another after that.' It is to mark this that the Eastern Church requires its bishops, the Church of Rome its priests, to be unmarried—a course which, as experience seems, at least in the latter case, to have proved, goes beyond the careful limits laid down in the New Testament. But the Church of England has erred in the other direction: neither our formularies nor our practice betray any token of being aware of this distinction, much less of providing for its recognition. It should surely not be impossible to make good the omission.

II

Just as the love for God and sense of His nearness which Jesus evoked in His followers expressed itself naturally in the word 'Father,' so the love for men which He kindled among them found utterance in the term 'brother.' Both terms alike on the lips of Jesus indicate an assertion of the highest and deepest elements of Jewish religion, wherein the nearness of God and the solidarity of His chosen people were twin features of cardinal prominence. Hence He is enabled, as in the one case, to assume, rather than teach, God's Fatherhood—for they have felt it through Him; so also in the other to assume, rather than teach, that His followers are 'brethren.' He no more teaches the Brotherhood of Man than the Fatherhood of God. The witness of the New Testament is clear on this point. The words

'brethren' and 'brother' are used habitually by the early Christian writers, both in the third person and in the vocative case, of their fellow-Christians and also of their fellow-Jews; but they are never used of Gentiles or the Gentile world. As a dogma, the brotherhood of man belongs to ancient Stoicism or modern Positivism; in Christianity its place is at the circumference, and we work out to it from the centre, which is Christ. No doubt the consummation of man's brotherhood, the welding of him into a spiritual unity, is a corollary of Christ's teaching; but for Him its realisation, as well as that of its correlative, his sonship to God, is so intensely a concrete thing that it lies still in the future.[1] It does not for Him correspond to present facts. And His immediate interest, therefore, is to extend the range of His own following, where alone sonship and brotherhood were experienced realities; and to give it some measure of coherence.

When we come to consider the form, if any, which Jesus impressed upon His Church, we are met by a number of difficulties. From a strictly historical point of view, can we say that He founded a Church at all? For the two passages in which He is recorded as speaking of it are both found in the First Gospel only; and it is generally supposed that that evangelist has been largely influenced by the ecclesiastical surroundings in which He compiled his Gospel. Again, can we find that Jesus gave to any person or body of persons amongst His followers a particular office or authority with regard to the rest? The answers given to this question are in close connexion with many of the greatest schisms of

[1] Matt. v. 45; Luke vi. 35. Cf. Phil. ii. 15, Eph. v. 1, and St. Paul's doctrine of sonship in Romans and Galatians.

Christendom. And yet again, did He leave to the body of His followers any corporate rites or customs or canons of discipline? Here, too, we are confronted with every kind of view, from Catholicism to that of the Society of Friends.

Now, the question as to whether Jesus founded a Church has been needlessly confused with another which is of much less importance—the question, namely, whether He ever used the word 'Church.' Antecedently there is no objection to it; for the word was used in the Old Testament to express the 'congregation' of Israel, when viewed in its religious aspect. It would have been just the word which Jesus needed to cover that 'remnant' of the people, whom He was calling out before the great and terrible day of the Lord should come. But the reasons for not insisting on the genuineness of the Matthæan passages are two. On the one hand, it is never wise to base any conclusion on isolated texts. And, on the other, these passages, whether genuine or not, have no essential bearing on the larger problem of the origin of the Church. That question is really capable of settlement independently of them. All the evidence goes to show that He did regard the body of those whom His preaching and teaching attracted as something distinct from the rest of mankind. Thus, He likens the Church to a field in which both wheat and tares are found—both genuine followers, that is to say, and false ones who did no more than say, Lord, Lord; and, again, to a draw-net, which is pulled to shore containing good fish and bad. And it is worth noting here that in the very earliest gathering of Christ's followers, even in His lifetime, the Church was a mixed body. The restriction of it to the 'con-

verted' or the 'saved,' which has been a mark of Puritanism, is just such an anticipation of judgment as Jesus Himself disowned.

Again, we find that throughout the Acts and the Epistles 'the brethren' is a technical term for the Christians in any place, and is convertible with 'the Church'; while, at the end of the first century, in the First Epistle of St. John, the word 'brother' seems to mean no more nor less than 'fellow-Christian.'[1] It is only natural to suppose that such a usage goes back to the Master Himself. His own usage of the term, moreover, both in the Sermon on the Mount and elsewhere, squares more readily with this view than with any other; though He probably denoted by it fellow-Jew as well as fellow-Christian, since every Jew was potentially one who was destined for the Kingdom.

When we come to the second question—that of the form of the Church—two problems present themselves, that of St. Peter's position, and that of the place of the Twelve. The first of these has been notoriously a matter of contention between Catholics and Protestants. But, if we adhere to our principle of refusing to base conclusions on isolated texts, most of the dust of that conflict appears somewhat irrelevant. What remains unimpeachable, however, is that in three distinct passages of the Gospels, coming from distinct sources, St. Peter stands out as entrusted with a special commission.[2] A critical case might be made out against any one of these passages separately; but together they

[1] Cf. 1 John iii. 14, 15, the parallelism between the plural and the singular. Cf. earlier Romans xiv. 10, 13, 15.

[2] Matt. xvi. 17, 18; Luke xxii. 32; John xxi. 15-19. It would seem purely perverse to doubt the genuineness of the Lucan passage.

produce a cumulative impression which cannot be gainsaid. And when we add to this the fact that, in every list [1] of the disciples which we have, the name of Simon Peter occurs first, we are forced to admit that the evidence could not be accounted for, unless Jesus had singled out Simon Peter for a special function in the Church. And in point of fact the Acts of the Apostles shows him as evidently the spokesman and leader of the brethren. Much is made of the presidency of James the Lord's brother in the Early Church. But it is only after St. Peter's imprisonment that we hear of that for the first time; and on the other two occasions when it is mentioned, there were good reasons why St. Peter should not be presiding, since he would have been judge in his own suit. The evidence as a whole seems to admit most easily of the view that St. Peter had in truth a primacy among the apostles; and that, when for any reason that was in abeyance, his place was taken by the eldest of 'the Lord's brothers.' [2]

But if St. Peter's position was a primacy, it was a primacy *inter pares*. Two groups of facts seem to make this clear. Firstly, he has no sole authority. St. Paul withstood him to the face; and the conservative party at Jerusalem had at an earlier date complained against him for taking the initiative in admitting Gentiles, uncircumcised, into the Church. There is no suggestion whatsoever that his word is law. And, secondly, there

[1] Mark iii. 16 = Matt. x. 2 = Luke vi. 14 = Acts i. 13. And according to John i. 35 Peter was not the first to be called.

[2] Cf. the very significant order of words in 1 Cor. ix. 5. The reason for James's position may be either that he was head of the local church in Jerusalem, or that he was next of kin to Jesus—a dynastic reason which the history of the Khalifate shows to have been favoured by Orientals.

is the position of the apostolate in the Church. They are the organ of authority and continuity. Theirs is a definite office; else why were they so careful to elect another in the place of Judas? And why should they have felt it necessary to send down two of their number to 'confirm' the converts of Samaria? And this function of the apostles in the Church goes back to the fact that Jesus had chosen twelve to be His disciples. Their intimate relation to Jesus in His ministry need not be laboured; the existence of such a book as *Pastor Pastorum* testifies to the large proportion of our Lord's recorded teaching which was given exclusively, or primarily, to them. In view of this there is no difficulty in supposing that He summed up for them their special place in the Church with the promise that 'in the regeneration, when the Son of Man shall sit on the throne of his glory, ye also shall sit upon twelve thrones, judging the twelve tribes of Israel.' Be that as it may, these words aptly express that position of authority in, and organic relationship to, 'the Israel of God,' which is the Church, attested in the Acts and the Epistles.

This is not the place to draw any practical inference from these conclusions. In large measure that has already been done by history. And, so far as concerns one fundamental point, history is probably right. It has been right in supposing that the functions which Jesus gave to St. Peter and to the Twelve represent the permanent form of the Church. This does not mean that He Himself looked down the ages, and saw their successors exercising them. But the permanence of the form is all the more marked, since it was impressed on a body on which 'the ends of the world had come,' and which He could even speak of as the anticipated

Kingdom. And this truth of the permanence of the form is enshrined by the Church in its doctrine and practice of succession.[1] But history is in constant need, too, of having its tendencies corrected—more than ever now, when a divided Christendom shows that they have worked themselves to an *impasse*. It might be hoped that some corrective guidance might be found in the teaching of Christ, and it is urged here that that does naturally involve a primacy in the Church, though not an independent one; and hence that neither the Roman view of the Church, nor that which prevails in the Orthodox and Anglican Churches, is in itself complete.

The third question concerns the institution of sacraments and of canons of discipline. As to the first, eschatology has removed the *a priori* difficulties which have been felt: for in Jewish and Jewish-Christian expectations of the Kingdom sacramental notions find an integral place. Thus, in the ninth chapter of Ezekiel, a chapter full of apocalyptic imagery, where impending judgment hangs over Jerusalem, the scribe in the vision is bidden to go through the city and set a mark upon the foreheads of all those who are ashamed of the prevailing idolatries, that they may escape the doom of the rest. Similarly, in the Book of Revelation, the four angels of punishment are bidden to 'hurt not the earth, neither the sea, nor the trees, till we shall have sealed the servants of our God on their foreheads.' As Schweitzer puts it, 'the conception of "marking out" and "sealing" plays

[1] If Matt. xvi. 17-20 and xix. 28 are not genuine, but belong to the latest recension of St. Matthew, they seem to attest the fact that during the last quarter of the first century a notion of succession was fairly clearly held in the Church: for their insertion would be most easily explained as a piece of ætiology.

in apocalyptic thought a very important part.' Similar provisions are a characteristic product of any intense expectation of the future.'[1] In the light of these facts, there is little difficulty in supposing that Jesus, for whom the New Age was so near, would naturally have given His disciples sacramental pledges which should betoken the fact of their having followed Him in faith, and so ensure their salvation when the Day of Destiny arrived.

But when we come to the details certain problems present themselves. Let us take baptism first. The Gospel evidence alone might leave us doubtful whether Christ taught anything about it. He went Himself to be baptized, and, according to the Fourth Gospel, His disciples baptized others. But, apart from this and from an isolated allusion to 'John's baptism,' the direct evidence is confined to the records of His conversation with Nicodemus and of the charge given to the apostles after the Resurrection. This would be a slender reed to lean upon, if it stood alone; but fortunately it does not. The practice of the primitive Church comes to assist us, and forces on us the conviction that Jesus must have given some teaching about baptism. Otherwise we could not explain their insistence upon it. It is true that there seems to have been some confusion in the practice, in the matter especially of the relation between the two baptisms—of water, and of the Holy Spirit—of which the Baptist had spoken.[2] The normal course appears to have been that those who repented were 'baptized into the name of Jesus Christ,' and received there and then the other baptism of the Spirit.[3] But sometimes the latter was delayed, owing to a flaw

[1] Schweitzer's *Paul and His Interpreters*, p. 243 (Eng. Trans.).
[2] Mark i. 8. [3] Acts ii. 38.

in the baptism of water,[1] and a special laying on of hands was necessary to impart the gift of the Spirit. Indeed, it is doubtful whether from the earliest times we must not suppose that 'the laying on of hands' followed immediately and normally on the baptism of water. The author of the Epistle to the Hebrews ranks it among 'the first principles of Christ.'[2] At other times, again, the baptism of the Spirit is an experience which precedes and gives a title for the baptism of water.[3] The minimum inference which these facts seem to impose upon us is that Jesus sanctioned John's baptism in such a way as to give it for His followers a reference to Himself and to the Spirit which would so soon be outpoured in immediate anticipation of the end.[4] In one way or another, possibly by the rite of laying on of hands, He took John's baptism and made it Christian.

And, secondly, there is the Breaking of Bread or Eucharist. From the point of view of eschatology, the symbolism of this rite makes it a very natural act of Jesus before His Passion; for the Kingdom was frequently depicted in Jewish thought under the figure of a banquet, so that of the coming age participation in the bread and wine which Jesus gave was a simple enough token. Moreover, if any doubt existed as to whether Jesus did actually institute the rite,[5] the practice of the

[1] Acts xviii. 25, xix. 1-7, where the baptism was the baptism of John, and so not in Christ's name. Acts viii. 12-16 is more difficult, as Philip's Samaritan converts had been baptized into the name of the Lord Jesus. I suggest an explanation in the text.

[2] Heb. vi. 2.

[3] Acts x. 47, ix. 17, where the laying on of hands conveys the gift of the Spirit, and is followed by baptism.

[4] Joel ii. 28, quoted in St. Peter's speech, Acts ii. 17-21.

[5] As among the Quakers and certain modern critics.

primitive Church should set it quickly at rest.[1] Even if He did not give the verbal command to repeat it, that practice is sufficient evidence of His intention.[2] Moreover, there are two pieces of evidence which make it probable that the Last Supper was not the first occasion when Jesus broke bread sacramentally, but that the same symbolism is present in the miracles of the Five Thousand and the Four Thousand.[3] The first is a curious and somewhat inconsequent tradition handed down by St. Mark of a conversation which Jesus had with His disciples in a boat on the Lake of Gennesaret.[4] A warning to 'beware of the leaven of the Pharisees and the leaven of Herod' is apparently taken literally by the disciples as bearing on the fact that they had forgotten to bring any bread with them. Jesus asks them why they are so undiscerning: have they forgotten the miracles of the Five Thousand and the Four Thousand? Do they not yet understand? Naturally a passage like this is fair game for critical speculation. Loisy, for instance, would assign it to the didactic hand of the evangelist, who wished to make clear that those miracles symbolised the salvation offered to the Jews and to the Gentiles. Very probably those miracles did have a symbolic meaning; but why not for Jesus Himself as well as for a later age? The Fourth Gospel plainly credits Jesus with a symbolic intention on the occasion of the Feeding of the Five Thousand; and it is difficult to see why St. Mark should arbitrarily have invented a conver-

[1] *E.g.* Acts ii. 42, 46, etc.; 1 Cor. x. 16.

[2] The command to repeat is absent from St. Mark's account and from St. Matthew's.

[3] And cf. Schweitzer's, *The Quest of the Historical Jesus*, pp. 377, 378 (Eng. Trans.).

[4] Mark viii. 14-21.

sation to show what the miracles really meant, especially as he does it in so obscure a way. It is far simpler to suppose that Jesus did on some occasion speak to His disciples of those miracles, and ask why they could not see the meaning of their symbolism. And what was that meaning? It was that He was the Messiah, and was already giving them an earnest of the Messianic banquet. It was not long after this that St. Peter did realise what it meant, and confessed Jesus to be the Christ.

Finally, it is to the celebration of the Lord's Supper in the early Church that we should look for the normal and regular exercise of the functions which Jesus had given to St. Peter and to the Twelve. There they would naturally preside.[1] The part they played as dispensers of the bread at the Feeding of the Five Thousand found its counterpart and continuation, when the Lord was present, no longer visibly, but in Spirit. But that is not the only sphere of their exercise. It is true that, when we try to discern more exactly in what ways their authority was determined, we find the evidence very meagre: but it does not fail us altogether. The Gospels speak of a definite commission 'to bind and to loose' conferred in one case upon St. Peter, in another upon the Twelve collectively. The two passages rest upon the authority of the First Gospel only; but the record is amply borne out, at least so far as regards the powers of the apostles in the practice of the early Church. 'To bind and to loose' means to forbid and to permit. Thus the Rabbi Jochanan said: 'Concerning gathering wood on a feast day, the school of Shammai binds it, the school

[1] Cf. Dr. Hamilton, *The People of God*, vol. ii. pp. 89-92; and Mr. Rawlinson's able appendix to his essay on 'The Principle of Authority' in the Oxford volume, *Foundations*.

of Hillel looses it.' So that the commission from Christ's lips gave the power to decide questions of faith and morals. This in point of fact is what we find the apostles doing. In the council at Jerusalem we see them loosing the severity of the Mosaic law towards the Gentiles, but binding on them certain abstentions. Indeed, their practice suggests that we should extend the term to cover also the retention and remission of sins.[1] St. John records a definite commission to forgive or retain sins given after the Resurrection. But in any case the apostles exercise this authority. St. Peter's punishment of Ananias and Sapphira is of the nature of such an act; and St. Paul exercised the power on two occasions in his dealings with the Corinthian Church. Taken as a whole, the evidence seems to be most easily accounted for, if Jesus had, as the Gospels record, promised His apostles that their exercise of authority in the Church should be ratified in Heaven.

[1] So Loisy, *Evangiles Synoptiques*, ii. p. 12, though he seems to regard the charge in Matt. xvi. as not authentic.

CHAPTER V

THE PERSON AND OFFICE OF CHRIST

READERS of Gibbon will remember the famous passage in which he ridicules the rival factions of the Church of the fourth century for boggling so long over an iota in their controversies upon the Person of Christ. Not all, however, are aware that in later years Gibbon revised his judgment, and confessed that on that iota the whole fortunes of Christianity were staked. But the lapse of time has certainly shown that his second opinion, and not his first, was the true one. During the century and more which has elapsed since Gibbon wrote, the question that has been asked most insistently by religious men has been the question involved in that iota. Was Jesus Christ 'from heaven, or of men'? Of one substance, or of like substance with the Father? True, the terms used in the debate have changed; we do not, for instance, use to-day the category of 'substance' in the same way. But the issue which men contend over is in essence the same; and the very keenness of their contention is a guarantee that the world still regards it as an issue of the first magnitude. Moreover, the histories of the several parties to the controversy are ample testimony in themselves to its practical importance. Compare, for instance, the story of the Church of England during the last century with that of the Protestant

Church in Germany. The latter still confesses the divinity of Christ in its formularies; but in its pulpit and its literature it belies it; and not all the patient industry and scholarly acumen of scores of theologians has been able to check its steady decline as a religious force in the country. In England we have had perhaps less learning—less, not in quality, but in amount and diffusion; but we have rejected the iota, and both spiritually and in its social work our Church is strong. The truth is that the robust Arianism of the Goths still survives in the Teutonic peoples of North Europe; and where that has been the case, not all their enterprise, their skill in government, their scientific activity, have been able to compensate them in religion for the loss of the doctrine of the Incarnation.

The practical success of a doctrine, however, over so short a space of time as one century, is no proof of its truth: and it is impossible for any thinking Christian simply to ignore the Protestant point of view. Since the days of Strauss and Baur, the task of Catholic theology in its bearing on the Person of Christ can never be the same as it was before. It has got to revise its methods —both morally and intellectually. Morally it must learn to 'meet with its enemy in the way.' For, though it is true that German liberal theology has shown the instability of many old foundations of dogma, that has not been its primary and stimulating motive. What lies at the bottom of it is not the love of destroying traditional beliefs, for destruction's sake. It is rather a genuine devotion to the Personality of which the Gospels, as well as tradition, speak. And, intellectually, it must look at the evidence from a critical starting-point. Criticism has bent its energies first of all towards dis-

covering what Jesus Christ was, as a fact of history, to Himself and His contemporaries. In face of such an endeavour, it is clearly of no avail to show what He meant to the men of the end of the first century, or of the second, or any other whatsoever. It is always possible that they exalted falsely One whom they had come to venerate so deeply, and thus gave divine attributes to a man. Our task is to show that the later estimate of Christ's Person, if it were a development from an earlier one, was a true and legitimate development, and not a travesty or distortion. The true method, as I have suggested in the Introduction, is first to find what the teaching of Christ—on this as on any other matter—meant to Himself and His contemporaries; and then to show, if it can be shown, how that is properly translated into the dogmas of the Church. It is true that this, the historical way of approaching the problem, is not always to be found among critics any more than among apologists. Both tend to read back into the Gospels the ideas of their own type of religion—on one side, the modern Jesus of the social gospel; on the other, the Christ of the Chalcedonian definition. Yet on the whole, Catholic theology has been under obligation to the Higher Criticism in this respect; and it cannot better acknowledge its debt than by using the weapons which criticism has forged, even though it turn them against the views of the critics.

I

One consequence involved in our acceptance of the critical method is that we are precluded from appealing to the Fourth Gospel as evidence for the witness of Jesus to Himself. Opinion on this Gospel is at present

in too fluid a state to admit of such an appeal carrying any weight. This does not mean that the book is unimportant for our purpose. It, no less than the Synoptic Gospels, is one of the facts of early Christian history which has to be accounted for, even if its value is not, like theirs, direct; and we are fully justified in using it to illustrate or reinforce what we cull from other and more widely accepted sources. But we shall be wise not to employ it, as, for instance, Liddon did in his Bampton Lectures. In the lecture devoted to our Lord's testimony to Himself, a large proportion of the evidence is taken from St. John. In the modern court of appeal this evidence is not allowed. On the other hand, there are certain traditional arguments which Liddon there develops with insurpassable power—arguments drawn from our Lord's life, actions, and method of appeal—to which we must give full weight. Why, for instance, does our Lord betray no consciousness of sin, unless He were sinless? Why have we no record of sin being imputed to Him by His enemies? The lives of the saints, who sought after and attained to holiness in no common measure, are full of penitence: Theresa calls herself 'The Sinner'; Francis went to the lepers for a penance. Yet there is no sign of such penitence in our traditions of the life of Christ. No argument can be deduced from His question to the young man: 'Why callest thou me good?' There is there no confession of sin. The circumstances of the incident are the true context of the question. The discourse, in which He had just been engaged, upon divorce, which is so typical of the moral disorder of society, had thrown into sharp relief at that moment the contrast between man's weakness and the incomparable holiness of God—a contrast which the

freshness and innocence of the children which they brought to Him only served to heighten. And He spoke as a man—one with men through His sympathy and understanding. 'Why callest thou me good? none is good save one, even God.' It is likely enough that the twenty-second Psalm, with which he was so familiar, came to His mind; where on one side is set the condition of him whom God seems to forsake, while on the other 'Thou continuest holy, O thou worship of Israel.'[1] Be that as it may, it was from this full identification of Himself with men, even in their severance from God, and from His desire to call His questioner, who was somewhat superficial, to the deeper conception of goodness which that involved, that Jesus disowned for Himself the title of 'good,' and told the young man to sell all that he had and give it to the poor.

Again, who is this who claims to forgive sin, to heal not only the ills of the body, but those of the soul? Who is this to whose name the devils are subject? Who is this who with unhesitating authority sets aside the Mosaic law, which He like His hearers believed to be divine, and substitutes another sanction in His own word alone? This is not simply a case of a radical reform of the current religion, such as was undertaken by Gautama in Hinduism, and gave rise to a new religion. The Buddha was not setting up his authority as overriding that of a revelation which he believed to be the gift of a transcendent God. Yet that was what Christ did. He was claiming to do for men of His day what God Himself, as He fully believed, had done for the Israelites of old. This was indeed to make Himself equal with God.

[1] Ps. xxii. 3; cf. Mark xv. 34.

Yet again, and parallel with this, our Lord's method of appeal was one which was unknown among the Jews before His time. He claimed for Himself a direct allegiance which under the old dispensation had been claimed for Jehovah alone. It is He whom men are now to follow; He whom they are to confess before men; He to whom they are to come for spiritual rest and refreshment. It is for His sake that they are to forsake all that they have—their possessions and the closest ties of relationship—for His sake that they are to be persecuted, and if need be to die. And here again, as in the case of His overriding of the Law, the claim of Jesus is all the more extraordinary in the light of the religious ideas amid which He lived. The Judaism of the four centuries preceding the Christian era had overlaid the service of the one God with many troublesome ordinances; but they had never hesitated to believe that Jehovah's claims to man's allegiance were unmediated and unshared. Yet Jesus asked for this absolute devotion for Himself. It is not surely to the Jews only that such claims might seem preposterous. We ourselves ought to repudiate them, if they seem to us anything less than the claims of One who is truth and life.

There is one other argument advanced by Liddon and the older theologians which cannot be employed in the same way to-day. We cannot say now that the miracles of Jesus are a direct proof of His divinity. This is not to endorse the converse statement, which is often heard, that for us Christ's miracles afford a difficulty to faith, where before they afforded a help. Neither statement is on the same plane of thought as that of those who handed down the records of our Lord's life; and therefore both

are irrelevant to a strictly historical discussion.[1] What is in point is rather such glimpses as we have of the significance which Christ's 'mighty works' had for Him and those about Him. We have already touched on the point in an earlier chapter in connection with the distinct connotations of the word 'faith' and its cognates in the Synoptic Gospels and St. John respectively: and it was seen that as a general rule the latter uses language of our Lord's 'miracles' which attributes to them a theological bearing not implied in the former. And yet there is one incident recorded in both St. Matthew and St. Luke which goes some way towards minimising this distinction. When John the Baptist sent to ask Jesus whether He was 'he that should come,' the Lord told them to return and acquaint their master with what they saw and heard—to wit, His miraculous works and the preaching of the good news of the Kingdom. The answer is doubtless of set purpose enigmatic. But we cannot say that the miracles are here spoken of by Jesus as merely the preludes of the Kingdom; for this would have been no answer, seeing that John had inquired as to His Person. Clearly, the Baptist is meant to draw the further inference if he will; not only were the energies of the new age at work, but He who was their spring and centre was the Messiah.[2] If the Kingdom had come by anticipation, so too had its King. If, then,

It is disappointing to find Dr. Montefiore, whose book, *The Synoptic Gospels*, I have found constantly useful, saying: 'We shall continue cheerfully to discredit the miracles, but to maintain the historical character of Jesus' (*op. cit.* i. 74). The task would be difficult.

[2] Cf. Is. xxxv. Is it possible that the Baptist's question and the incredulity or doubt behind it, was due to the fact that Jesus was not fulfilling literally the Messianic prophecy of Isaiah lxi? There

we may regard this story as indicating that Jesus allowed His miracles an indirect, though not a direct, bearing on His Person, we have a bridge which helps to span the cleft between the Synoptists and St. John. For it seems to be the habit of the Fourth Gospel to read back into the overt history of Jesus elements which, if there, were historically there only *sub velo*, and were discovered in their full import by a later age. The direct bearing on His Person ascribed to Christ's miracles must be pronounced unhistorical; but since Jesus did give to them an indirect bearing, the Johannine account may be considered as a legitimate interpretation of the facts, and the same concession may be granted to all who have followed the Fourth Evangelist in giving to the miracles an apologetic value.

To sum up, then, this part of our inquiry. As a general rule, we must at present dispense with the traditional appeal to the Fourth Gospel as evidence for the divinity of Christ. Moreover, the arguments often adduced from His miraculous works cannot be given the weight which has been attached to them in some quarters. He Himself regards them as a subsidiary part of His work, and as signs rather of the imminent Kingdom than of His own Messiahship; though He probably vouchsafed to them an indirect bearing upon the latter. On the other hand, certain traditional contentions of the Church still hold as good as ever, such as those which are based upon the absence of all note of penitence from His sayings, the unhesitating authority with which He supersedes

it was said that the Lord's anointed would 'proclaim liberty to the captives, and the opening of the prison to them that are bound.' Yet John was still in chains. Must not Jesus have delivered him, if He could?

the Mosaic law by a higher one, and the sovereign way in which He requires of His disciples absolute devotion to Himself. These things go far to justify the old dilemma : *Aut Deus aut homo non bonus.*[1]

II

Hitherto we have tried to estimate at their modern value the chief general arguments in favour of the divinity of Christ which have come down to us from the orthodox theologians of the past. It is now time for us to step into the theatre of war, where not individuals only, but whole churches, not scholars only and thinkers, but educated democracies, are giving battle with the most up-to-date weapons they can find. The centre of religious controversy is still what it was—the Person of Christ : only now it has shifted back from the terms of Hellenistic philosophy to those of Jewish thought in the first century and earlier. Was Jesus or was He not Messiah ? And if He was, did He overtly claim to be so, or was it for most of His life a secret ? And in either case, what kind of Messiah was He ? And was His consciousness of being Messiah the same as His consciousness of being the Son of God, or was it distinct from it ? These are some of the problems which cry aloud for solution, and which we have now to face.

The title which is superscribed on this chapter was

[1] On this paragraph Prof. Burkitt has kindly written the subjoined note, the point of which I fully accept : 'The difference is that *Deus* has a somewhat different connotation to us from what it had to those who formulated the dilemma. What I venture to think we may reasonably refuse is the form of the dilemma in which *Deus* retains its old external, almost 'Deistic' connotation. The point was well formulated by Loisy in *Autour d'un petit Livre*, p. 155 (quoted in my *Early Eastern Christianity*, p. 94, note).'

deliberately chosen to represent a convenient formal division of our inquiry. The Person and the Office of Christ can be treated apart, whatever their true bearing may be—and there is such a bearing—of the one upon the other. Under the head of His Person fall all those intimations which the Gospels disclose of His relation to God and to men: by His Office I understand the particular functions which He believed that He was to fulfil in the scheme of things. One might say that the former of these two parts of the discussion relates to what Jesus believed He was, the latter to what He believed He had to do: only it must be remembered that the determination of the second will probably have a strong reflex influence upon our conception of the first.

At the outset let us premise that we shall expect to find the signs of what Jesus thought Himself to be rather hidden and unobtrusive than lying open on the face of the Gospel narrative. A man does not reveal His inmost self and the springs of His personal religion in public controversy and discourse. They indeed shine through these and illuminate them, so that those of insight can see what is behind; but their light itself is always kept somewhat in reserve. It will often happen, then, that the elements in a man's life which more than any others constitute it and give it its character will be those which are least directly revealed in any record of him. Those most intimate with him know them and treasure them up; but it is only unawares that they escape into the open air from a man's own lips; and even then it will not be by way of plain statement, but of suggestion, allusion, implication. Blooms they are too tender to be exposed to every climate; we must finger the foliage and set it aside, if we would see them nestling underneath.

Or are they not even so accessible as this, but rather the buried roots that can only be guessed from their flower ?

Yet even roots sometimes show above ground ; and we have every reason to hope that in the case of Jesus Christ such fragmentary indications should exist as might reveal in some fashion what lay at the bottom of His Being. What does He show us of His personal communion with, and relation to, the Unseen ? Of His revelation of God I have spoken in another place ; we are now rather concerned to discover what God showed Him about Himself. And it is here that the passages where He speaks of God as ' my Father ' or ' my Father which is in heaven ' are of such decisive moment. They are not many in number, nor is their primary reference to the Person of Christ at all ; but for that very fact they are all the more significant. For it is noticeable that, while Jesus speaks of ' my Father ' and of ' the Father,' and, in discoursing with the Twelve, of ' your Father,' He never uses the term ' Our Father ' to include Himself and His hearers under the same category. The case in the Lord's Prayer is no exception, since it is given to the disciples to be used by them, not by Himself with them. The only possible explanation of these facts is that Jesus believed His Sonship of God to be of a different character from that of His disciples. Such a conclusion is indeed momentous. Not that we are any nearer fathoming the depths of that communion which the Lord had with God : the great difficulty which has befallen all who have wholly rested upon God in describing their spiritual experience warns us that it would be idle to speculate upon the confessedly disparate experience of Christ. But what is established beyond cavil is that Jesus regarded Himself as having a relation

to God which was unique among men. Those theories, therefore, which regard Jesus as the 'elder brother' of mankind are beside the mark; they do not do justice to the facts, nor recognise a distinction which knows no exception in the evidence available.

We need not delay here to point out how this uniqueness, which is to be detected so unmistakably in the Synoptic record of the teaching of Jesus, is developed and brought to the fore by St. John, though of course under different forms of thought. There Jesus has come forth from the Father, and will return to God who sent Him; His acts and His teaching are in truth the Father's; for He is in the Father, and the Father in Him; they are 'one thing.' But this development, even if it does not represent the *ipsissima verba* of Jesus, goes in no way beyond the outlines already disclosed in the earlier Gospels. It fills in what they give us; it does not materially enhance it. But it is worth while to dwell for a moment upon one or two passages in Christ's teaching, as the Synoptists give it, where the truth of His uniqueness seems to be yet further driven home. When, for instance, He says that 'whosoever receiveth me, receiveth not me, but him that sent me,' He must surely imply that God is immanent in Him in the Johannine sense. What wonder that He found the appellation 'Son of David,' true as it was in its sphere, inadequate to His Person! 'If David therefore call him Lord, how is he then his son?'—for the Psalmist's language adumbrated what Jesus knew by innermost experience to be true, to wit, that He was something greater than man. David himself was accounted Son of God, as being king of Israel: Jesus knew that He possessed a higher and fuller Sonship yet, which pertained not merely to His

office, as David's antitype, but rather to the essential law of His Being.

It is on the grounds of this uniqueness in His relation to the Father, that we must think of Jesus as calling Himself absolutely 'the Son.' But here a difficulty arises. 'Son of God' was one of the appellations of the Messiah. In the Old Testament the title had been variously employed. It was given to angels, to judges, to the king of Israel. In this last case, at least, the usage was probably derived from the conception of the chosen people, the whole Israel, as the Son of God, where the title connotes the recipient as specially favoured and privileged by God. Hence it was applied to Israel's king, whether the king actually then reigning, or the ideal king, the Messiah, who was to reign hereafter; for He was Israel's representative. In such a psalm, for instance, as the eighty-ninth, it is not clear whether by the 'first-born' is intended the Davidic house, or the king, or the whole Jewish people. So elastic is the title, yet always with the note of God's special favour about it. And in later times 'Son of God' appears to have been a regular title of Messiah. In the Book of Enoch we find allusion to 'my Son, the Messiah'; Caiaphas at the trial of Jesus asks Him whether He is 'the Messiah, the Son of the Blessed.' The difficulty that arises, then, in connection with the Lord's self-designation as 'the Son' is this: Did He mean by it that He was the Messiah? or did it connote for Him something less official and more personal? Both views are held by scholars well qualified to judge, and it is no easy matter to answer the question.

The truth would seem to be that the two views, as is so frequently the case, are not mutually exclusive, while neither taken by itself does adequate justice to all the

facts. We have already seen that Jesus, quite apart from His use of the appellation of 'the Son,' stood in an unique relation of Sonship (as He believed) to the Father. It was natural, then, that He should sometimes call Himself 'the Son,' as being distinct from all other sons of God. It is thus, for instance, that, when He disowns any detailed knowledge of the end of the age, when He says: 'Of that day and that hour knoweth no one, not even the angels in heaven, neither the Son, but the Father,' He ranks Himself next to God, and above the angels, in the hierarchy of being. So, too, when He speaks of that perfect knowledge which He and the Father have of one another: 'All things have been delivered unto me of my Father: and no one knoweth the Son, save the Father; neither doth any know the Father, save the Son, and he to whomsoever the Son willeth to reveal Him.'[1] All things have been delivered—not surely all knowledge only, but also all that knowledge gives of authority and power. In moments of exaltation such as is here revealed the Personality knows no limits to its scope; it reaches out and grasps infinitude. Not even in the Fourth Gospel do the claims of Jesus transcend this. All that we read there of His knowledge of God and God's knowledge of Him, of His being the object of the Father's unwavering and unfailing love, of the commission to Him of the Father's prerogatives

[1] Harnack has written a detailed excursus on this passage at the end of *The Sayings of Jesus*, in which he decides that the words 'no one knoweth the Son, save the Father,' were not originally in Q, and so are not authentic. I am not sure that this reasoning is convincing; but either way, the points I urge in the text are not affected. It is worth noting that the very early use of the titles 'the Father' and 'the Son,' *e.g.* in 1 Thess. i. 1, Acts i. 4, 7, and 1 Cor. xv. 28 strongly suggests that at least the idea they contain had come down from Jesus Himself.

of judgment and of life—all this is contained in germ in the words which we read in St. Matthew. And they are only of a piece with what He says, or rather implies, elsewhere of His relation to the Father.

But there is no reason to suppose that because Jesus spoke of Himself as 'the Son' in this absolute sense, He did not also think of Himself as Messiah under the same connotation. The greater contains in itself the less: His absolute Sonship might always be determined in a special direction and for a particular task. It was at His baptism that He became first conscious that it was to be so determined, when, in the pictorial phrasing which must surely go back to Himself, 'a voice came out of the heavens, Thou art my beloved Son, in thee I am well pleased.'[1] Two Messianic passages of the Old Testament are here combined—the one coming from the second Psalm, the other from the chapters of Isaiah which refer to the Servant of the Lord. And close upon His baptism follows His temptation, where He is tempted as Messiah: 'If thou be the Son of God,' says Satan; the newly-bestowed powers are no sooner His than He has to decide upon the true principles and conditions of their exercise. It was then that He bound the strong man, so that He could 'enter into his house and spoil his goods.' Again, it is in the Messianic sense that He is confessed to be 'Son of God' by the demoniacs, if indeed we can set any store by their half-articulate cries; that He is hailed as 'beloved Son' by a voice out of the cloud at the Transfiguration; that He likens Himself to the 'son' for whom the king made a marriage feast, and to the 'son' whom the lord of the vineyard sent to

[1] Mark i. 11. The Old Testament references are Ps. ii. 7 and Is. xlii. 1.

gather the fruit which had been surlily refused to the 'servants.' This last parable indeed is full of significance for Christ's Person. For there the contrast between the servants and the 'one, a beloved son' is too marked to be an accident of the tale; it must surely betoken a difference of standing between Jesus and all God's messengers who had preceded Him, such as constitutes a personal uniqueness. It would seem as though behind this parable there lurked the double consciousness—the consciousness of unique and absolute Sonship, and the consciousness of being Son of God in the determinate Messianic sense. Be that as it may, the Messianic implication involved in our Lord's use and acceptance of the title 'Son' seems as well grounded in history as the other and more general connotation. But neither need be, nor, so far as the evidence goes, is, exclusive of the other. We shall best explain all the facts, if we maintain that Jesus from a time before the Marcan story opens—and may we not perhaps attach some credence to St. Luke's tradition of the little boy who 'must be about his Father's business?'—knew Himself to be in an unique personal sense the Son of God, joined to Him in complete spiritual union by His inmost Being; and that at a definite point of history, coincident with the revival which the Baptist inaugurated, He became convinced that it was laid upon Him to be also 'the Son of God' in the sense of the Messiah, the promised ruler of Israel. Such a conclusion does not indeed amount to a vindication of the belief of Jesus in His own divinity; but it points some way towards it; and at the least it ranks as one of those outstanding facts in the view Jesus had of Himself, on which any theological theory as to His Person must be based.

We turn now from the consideration of what Jesus was to the discussion of those functions which He believed Himself sent to fulfil. At first we may tread on uncontroversial ground : for there are a few passages in which He characterises His mission quite generally, and these are not disputed. First, it is *prophetic*. He has come to preach the good tidings and to call sinners to repentance. The key to the first half of the Marcan narrative is His desire to disseminate His message over as large an area as possible, while there is yet time. And if He says that He has come to cast fire on the earth, to bring, not peace, but a sword, He is alluding to the spiritual conflagration and the sharp cleavages of moral awakening, which are the proper fruit of the prophet's work. And, secondly, His mission is *redemptive*. He has been sent to seek and to save the sheep that were lost, as Ezekiel had prophesied that Jehovah should do. 'Behold, I myself, even I, will search for my sheep and will seek them out. As a shepherd seeketh out his flock in the day that he is among his sheep that are scattered abroad, so will I seek out my sheep ; and I will deliver them out of all places whither they have been scattered in the cloudy and dark day.'[1] Can Jesus have been unaware that His redemptive task was one that the prophets had reserved for Jehovah alone ? He was the Good Shepherd, who lays down His life for the sheep. For He came not to be ministered unto, but to minister, and to give His life a ransom for many. He must redeem even though it cost His death.

But in what capacity is He to save ? What, if any, is His place in the kingdom of which He spreads the good tidings ? To some extent I have anticipated the answer

[1] Ez. xxxiv. 11, 12.

to this question when discussing the Messianic implication involved in the title 'Son of God' which Jesus used of Himself. But more is needed than that. There is no problem in New Testament study more difficult and involved than that of the Messiahship of Jesus. There are at least three separate questions which have to be dealt with before we can go any distance at all. The first is as to whether Jesus Himself ever called Himself Messiah. Supposing the answer to be in the affirmative, the second question arises as to what Messianic titles He used of Himself. And, thirdly, we have to try to determine what the meaning of them was. It is almost impossible to avoid some overlapping in the discussion of these questions: but that is much better than passing over any well-grounded point of view which is to the fore in modern theology.

1. Some very competent scholars, notably Wellhausen and Wrede, have asserted that Jesus never did say or imply that He was the Messiah. All those sayings of His about 'the Son of God' or 'the Son of Man,' which tend in the contrary direction, are to be regarded, they urge, as editorial additions to His actual words. What happened was that the memory of His magnetic Personality drew to itself, like salts in a super-saturated solution, the attributes and titles which the popular mind of that day connected with the Messiah; and once these had crystallised, they were held to represent the claims which Jesus had made for Himself. His authentic claims, they say, did not really exceed those of a prophet.

But there are two rocks upon which such a view as this seems to founder. How, if it be true, are we to account for the admitted existence in the primitive Church of the belief in the Messiahship of Jesus? The

doctrine of crystallisation will not suffice in a case where the attributes of the expected Messiah were in such staring contrast with the known facts of the life of Jesus. It is urged that what made all the difference was the Resurrection; disciples who had been faithless at their Master's trial were converted and became believing when they saw Him risen from the dead. But this is to ask too much of the Resurrection. It was never hinted in Jewish literature that Messiah should rise from the dead. It is likely enough that those who had learnt to believe that Jesus was the Messiah in His lifetime, and had fallen away in a time of great stress should be recalled; but hardly that the belief should then spring up in them for the first time. They might well argue after the Resurrection: 'So *after all* our Master was the Messiah'; but not, as the theory we are criticising would require: '*Therefore* our Master was the Messiah.'

Again, a special difficulty arises in connection with our Lord's use of Messianic titles. Were His use of them always modelled in point of directness upon His question to the scribes as to the Son of David, their genuineness might perhaps be doubted; though even so it would be something of an artificial doubt. But the case is not so. In every passage in which the phrase 'the Son of Man' occurs in the Gospels, it occurs on the lips of our Lord Himself. It is surely incredible that, if that title had not been actually employed by Him, but had been foisted on Him by a later generation, such a limitation of usage would be found. The fact admits far more easily of the view that Jesus did use the title of Himself, but that it had been supplanted in popular parlance by others, such as 'Christ,' when the Gospels came to be written.

2. What kind of Messiah? That is the further question. For there were many types of Messiah in Jewish expectation. It may be well perhaps to set forth in some detail the two principal types, as they meet us in pre-Christian literature. On the one hand, there is the Messiah for whose attributes the *locus classicus* is the eleventh chapter of Isaiah: 'And there shall come forth a shoot out of the stock of Jesse, and a branch out of his roots shall bear fruit: and the spirit of the Lord shall rest upon him, the spirit of wisdom and understanding, the spirit of counsel and might, the spirit of knowledge and of the fear of the Lord; and his delight shall be in the fear of the Lord: and he shall not judge after the sight of his eyes, neither reprove after the hearing of his ears: but with righteousness shall he judge the poor, and reprove with equity for the meek of the earth.' The main features which belong to this Messiah are all found in this description. He is to be the Son of David: He shall be endued with God's spirit, by favour of which He would be marked out as the Son of God: He is to 'judge,' that is, to rule, and the first characteristic of His sovereignty is righteousness. This is the figure which is delineated, with stress laid particularly on this or on that element in the whole, by the Psalmist, by the redactor of the Book of Deuteronomy, by Jeremiah, by the author of the Psalms of Solomon. In the Psalter, He is the Lord's anointed,[1] His firstborn,[2] the Son of God;[3] in the Book of the Law, He is a prophet, like unto Moses, and the words of God shall be put in His mouth;[4] for Jeremiah, who lived through the doom of

[1] Ps. lxxxix. 38, ii. 2. [2] Ps. lxxxix. 27. [3] Ps. ii. 7.
[4] Deut. xviii. 15-18, variously taken by the Jews ▬ referring to Messiah or to Messiah's forerunner; contrast John i. 45 with John i. 25.

the Holy City, He is the branch of the Davidic house, who shall 'reign as king and deal wisely,'[1] thus regenerating the withered stump; the Psalms of Solomon, written about forty years before Christ was born, speak of Him as 'the Lord Messiah,' and say that with the weapons of holiness, faith, wisdom, and justice He will vanquish Israel's foes and set up God's kingdom on earth.[2] But through all variation the underlying idea stands fast. This Messiah is definitely human, born of royal stock, despite his metaphorical title of 'Son of God'; He is a warrior who will drive back the enemies of Israel and extend His dominion over all the earth; then in this Kingdom of God He will rule, and the chief note of His rule will be righteousness. There is nothing here of that narrowness and ethical unworthiness which certain commentators have been only too ready to ascribe to the Messianic hope of the Jews. National and political indeed it was, but it was this in the noblest and highest sense which those words could sustain. If some of the Jewish contemporaries of Jesus had devitalised the Messianic hope of its ethical character, that was the fault of their own outlook and circumstances, not of the belief itself.

But along with this human and ethical conception of the Messiah there thrived, during at least the two centuries which preceded our era, another which was mystical and supernatural, and clothed itself in the title of 'the Son of Man.' The seed-plot of this conception was the Book of Daniel,[3] written soon after the desecration

[1] Jer. xxiii. 5. [2] Ps. Sol. xvii., xviii.

[3] In earlier books of the Old Testament 'son of man' is simply a periphrasis for 'man'; though in the case of Ezekiel, who is frequently so addressed, the note of man's frailty is probably also present.

of the temple by Antiochus Epiphanes in 172 B.C. In the seventh chapter the writer describes how he saw in a vision four great beasts, which came up out of the sea; the first three were severally like a lion, a bear, and a leopard; and the fourth was 'terrible and powerful and strong exceedingly; and it had great iron teeth.' To each of these in turn was given dominion. Then, he continues, 'I beheld till thrones were placed, and one that was ancient of days did sit: . . . thousand thousands ministered unto him, and ten thousand times ten thousand stood before him: the judgment was set, and the books were opened.' The fourth beast was then slain, and the other three were deprived of their rule. 'I saw in the night visions, and, behold, there came with the clouds of heaven one like unto a son of man, and he came even to the ancient of days and they brought him near before him. And there was given him dominion, and glory, and a kingdom, that all the peoples, nations, and languages should serve him: his dominion is an everlasting dominion, which shall not pass, and his kingdom that which shall not be destroyed.' And the interpretation of the vision is this. The four bestial figures typified the four heathen empires which had oppressed Israel—those of Babylon, Media, Persia, and Greece. In the same way the human figure also betokened an empire—namely, the rule of Israel in the Kingdom of God, after all foes had been destroyed. As the seer himself writes: 'I beheld . . . until the ancient of days came, and judgment was given to the saints of the Most High; and the time came that the saints possessed the kingdom.' Under these circumstances it cannot be right to interpret, as a few commentators do, the phrase 'one like unto a son of man' as meaning

the Messiah. The context and the exposition of the vision given afterwards alike show that 'Son of Man' here means simply 'man,' as frequently in Hebrew literature;[1] and that what is denoted is a manlike figure in contrast to the beast-like figures which had gone before.

But it was not for long that this visionary figure was allowed to be so symbolic and impersonal. Some seventy or eighty years after the Book of Daniel was written, another writer[2] in the apocalyptic tradition gave him flesh and blood. 'And there I saw One who had a Head of Days, and his head was white like wool, and with Him was another Being whose countenance had the appearance of a man and his face was full of graciousness, like one of the holy angels. And I asked the angel who went with me and showed me all the hidden things concerning the Son of Man, who he was and whence he was, and why he went with the Head of Days? And he answered and said unto me, This is the Son of Man who hath righteousness, with whom dwelleth righteousness, and who reveals all the treasures of that which is hidden, because the Lord of Spirits hath chosen him, and his lot before the Lord of Spirits hath surpassed everything in uprightness for ever. . . .'[3]

And later on we read: 'And thus the Lord commanded the kings and the mighty and the exalted, and those who dwell on the earth, and said, Open your eyes and lift up your horns if ye are able to recognise the Elect One. And the Lord of Spirits seated him (*i.e.* the Messiah) on the throne of His glory, and the spirit of righteousness was poured out upon him, and the word of

[1] *E.g.* Ps. viii. 4.

[2] I here follow the division and dating of the Book of Enoch which is given by Dr. Charles, who has made an exhaustive study of it.

[3] Enoch xlvi. 1-3.

his mouth slew all the sinners, and all the unrighteous were destroyed before his face. And there will stand up in that day all the kings and the mighty, and the exalted, and those who hold the earth, and they will see and recognise him how he sits on the throne of his glory, and righteousness is judged before him and no lying word is spoken before him. Then shall pain come upon them as on a woman in travail, . . . And one portion of them will look on the other, and they will be terrified, and their countenance will fall, and pain will seize them when they see that Son of Man sitting on the throne of his glory. And the kings and the mighty . . . will glorify and bless and extol him who rules over all, who was hidden. For the Son of Man was hidden before him and the Most High preserved him in the presence of his might and revealed him to the elect. And the congregation of the holy and elect will be sown, and all the elect will stand before him on that day. And all the kings and the mighty . . . will fall down on their faces before him and worship and set their hope upon that Son of Man, and will petition him and supplicate for mercy at his hands. . . . And the righteous and elect will be saved on that day . . . and the Lord of Spirits will abide over them, and with that Son of Man will they eat and lie down and rise up for ever and ever.' [1]

It has been necessary to quote at such considerable length in order to show the contrast between this conception of the Messiah and the other. Instead of a human Messiah, we have one who is superhuman and indeed pre-existent with God ; instead of His conquering Israel's foes, He burns them up with the word of His mouth ; not merely a victory, but a celestial judgment

[1] Enoch lxii. 1-9, 13, 14.

—'the day of anguish and affliction,' 'the day of tribulation and pain,' as it is called—will prelude the inauguration of the Kingdom of God. And this conception of the Book of Enoch is a development from an earlier one in Daniel, which is not in itself Messianic. That is important; for it shows us that, if the Danielic figure was to be personified, this was how it could be done. Whether the tradition which centred round this supernatural person was widespread or not, at any time, we cannot say. Theologians tend to answer that question either way, in accordance with the requirements of their particular views as to the usage of it by Jesus. But in reality the evidence fails us. Beyond a reference to 'the likeness of a man' in the Second Book of Esdras,[1] there is no other certain mention of it in Jewish literature by this name; though there is further evidence which bears witness to belief in a Messiah who was supernatural rather than human.

3. The third point concerns the sense in which our Lord used the title 'the Son of Man.' There are two main groups of answers to this question. In the one it is contended that we should take the title in its traditional Messianic sense, and regard its predicates as analytical; while in the other we are bidden to delve into the terms of the title itself, and draw out of them whatever stores of meaning they may contain. Both lines of interpretation have the authority of great names behind them; though in England the second method has on the whole received more freely the sanction of theologians.[2] Let us therefore consider it first.

[1] 2 Esdras xiii. 3.

[2] Bishop Westcott advocated this view. He is supported, among others, by Bruce, Bernard Weiss, Stanton, and Stevens.

By calling Himself 'the Son of Man,' it is maintained, Jesus meant to denote Himself as the ideal or representative man, in whom all the highest possibilities of human nature were brought to their destined fulfilment. This title was chosen by Jesus just because it was not a current title of Messiah; for the Synoptic narrative shows clearly that He did not wish His Messiahship to be bruited abroad. It would have profited little to enjoin silence upon the demoniacs and others whom He cured, if all the time He were speaking of Himself by an appellation which at once gave away His secret. On the other hand, if the title were not for our Lord Messianic, but ethical, it was only natural that it should be understood very early in the Christian community in a Messianic sense; for in His predictions of suffering and of returning in the clouds of Heaven, Jesus applied to Himself two features which current belief assigned to the Messiah. In short, the phrase expresses the relation of Jesus to humanity, just as the parallel phrase 'the Son of God' marks His peculiar relation to God: and it is as mankind's representative that He forgives sins, and claims lordship of the Sabbath, goes to His fore-destined death, and will return to judge the world.

There is a certain attractiveness in the symmetry of this view of our Lord's use of the title which must commend it at first sight; but on investigation it will be found in this simple form to encounter difficulties which are well-nigh insurmountable. The first is that such a use of the words 'Son of Man' has affinities neither backwards nor forwards. The Jews were not familiar on any extended scale with the idea of representation; but where it does occur it does not clothe itself in this form. The Messiah was regarded as the future repre-

sentative of Israel, its embodied idea; but he is called 'son of David,' never 'son of Israel.' Again, looking forward from the days of Jesus, where do we see this conception germinating in the primitive Church? Possibly in St. Paul's phrase 'the last Adam';[1] but nowhere else. Yet it is scarcely conceivable that it should have left so slight a trace in the New Testament, if it had received the hall-mark of our Lord. True, 'the Son of Man' occurs only once in the New Testament outside the Gospels; but that is intelligible enough, if it meant Messiah—the supernatural Messiah of Daniel and Enoch—since there were synonyms which could express it equally well; and 'Christ' and 'Lord' would come very much more readily to the pen of a Hellenistic writer. Moreover, we cannot blink the fact that the words 'Son of Man' had in certain definite instances prepared the way for, and been used in, a Messianic reference. It is possible that 'the Son of Man' was not a current Messianic title in any of the circles of Jewish society which our Lord directly touched in His lifetime; though a casual question[2] of the Jews related in the Fourth Gospel, which so often surprises us by its accuracy on points of Jewish custom and terminology, suggests that this is far too sweeping a conclusion. Jesus had been speaking of His death, when He would be 'lifted up from the earth'; and 'the multitude therefore answered him, We have heard out of the law that the Christ abideth for ever: and how sayest thou, The Son of Man must be lifted up? Who is this Son of Man?' The last question is half contemptuous: the notion of 'the

[1] 1 Cor. xv. 45.

[2] John xii. 34. Westcott makes this passage tell the other way; but the order of the Greek words necessitates our stressing the word 'this,' if we would be true to Greek idiom.

Son of Man' being crucified was ridiculous for any one who knew the tradition about Him. Let us, however, waive this point, and suppose that 'the Son of Man' was not a current title of Messiah in any quarters; let us grant even further that our Lord Himself did not know how the phrase in Daniel had been developed in a Messianic direction by the author of the Book of Enoch; though here again we have to recognise that the number of verbal parallels between sayings of Jesus and passages in Enoch renders His acquaintance with that book more than probable.[1] Yet even so, it was always open for Jesus to have done with the vision of Daniel what Enoch had done before him, and personified for His own purposes the typical figure there portrayed, which stood for the saints of the Kingdom. And finally, if such were the case, His use of the title would clearly have given away no hint as to His Messiahship; while if the people did know that 'the Son of Man' was a title of the Messiah, they and the disciples too would necessarily have been completely mystified by His use of it, seeing that the manner of His life belied at every turn all the expectations associated with the phrase. At first this need have occasioned no anger; bewilderment would be their first emotion; and, after all, the cures He performed and His message of repentance formed a much more practical and tangible interest than any speculations as to why He chose to call Himself by so incompatible a title. What is important to remember is that we have no means of deciding how far 'the Son of Man' was current as a Messianic title among the Jews of our Lord's time. If one may hazard a guess, my own belief

[1] See the Introduction to Charles's edition of the *Book of Enoch*—a thorough and masterly study.

would be that Jesus Himself and some of His hearers knew the use of the title in the Book of Enoch, while the majority did not. But this can be no more than a guess. In any case, the facts seem best explained if we suppose that Jesus used the title in a Messianic sense, deriving it indirectly from Daniel, if not directly from Enoch, and that the predicates of it in the Gospels are to be regarded as analytical.

If this view however prevail, it will be found to be not wholly exclusive of the other. For 'the Son of Man' in Daniel is, if not indeed representative Man, yet still symbolic of Man as he is going to be. The title is a collective one, embracing 'the saints of the Most High.' In this sense it is fair to say that it is expressive of a relation to humanity. But the development of this implicate of the title is not to be found in the teaching of Jesus Himself so much as in that of St. Paul. Its first interest for Jesus is as an appellation of Messiah. Yet it is important to remember that it had in Daniel this collective significance; and we shall see reason in the following chapter to suppose that St. Paul, in drawing out this side of it, was interpreting what lay latent, but unvoiced, in the thought of the Master Himself.

The general conclusion thus reached is confirmed, if we examine the passages where 'the Son of Man' occurs.[1] The great bulk of them refer either to His exaltation and glory, or to His humiliation and death. He will come in power, and He must suffer—those are the two themes which recur throughout His teaching; and they have their corollaries in the present: He

[1] In some passages it is probably not authentic, but due to the redactor, *e.g.* Matt. xvi. 13, 28. If the redactor has done this, may not the sources have done likewise in some other instances?

has authority to forgive sins, or to deal with the Sabbath, and He is more homeless and destitute even than foxes or fowls of the air, or is misunderstood and abused because He comes 'eating and drinking.' I speak of them as corollaries, for they follow from the fact that the Son of Man was already present in the Person of Jesus Himself. Thus they are in character with those passages in which the Kingdom is regarded as already present. But they call for no special treatment in themselves. What we should notice rather about both groups of sayings is their traditional and dogmatic character. This is manifestly the case with the first group, which deal with the Son of Man's exaltation and glory,[1] since it is these things which are particularly predicated of Him in Daniel and Enoch. It is no less true, though in a different way, of the second, in which Jesus foretells the Son of Man's humiliation and death.[2] They spring—not indeed, like the first group, from the notion of the Son of Man as such—but from that notion when it was transfused in the crucible of Christ's living experience on earth. It was this which showed Him that the Son of Man's glory could not be won save by passing through 'the grave and gate of death.' After all there was no provision made in the tradition for a Son of Man who walked on earth before He was invested with His heavenly prerogative. That had to be beaten out by Jesus Himself. And it is here that His originality shines out superbly. If on the one side He was uniquely linked with God and knew it, on the other He was not absolved from the exercise of faith in the proving of His vocation. Once the Temptation was conquered, sacrifice and suffering

[1] Cf. especially Mark ii. 10, 28; viii. 38; xiii. 26; Matt. xix. 28.
[2] *E.g.* Mark viii. 31; ix. 12, 31; x. 33, 45.

had become the law of His life, because He chose to walk by faith. Such faith when it has issued in action brings insight; and it was in the light of what His insight revealed that He interpreted the meaning and end of His Messiahship. When it was revealed to Him that He must die we do not know. But the opposition of the Jewish leaders and the death of John the Baptist [1] seem to have been the decisive facts which showed Him the inevitable implicates of such a calling as His; so that the predictions of the Passion may well have occurred, as our Gospels record them, soon after the second retirement from the Sea of Galilee. In any case it seems certain that they followed hard upon the moment when the Twelve came to confess Him as the Christ. This being so, the form of the predictions is very significant. It is probable enough that they have been worked over by a later hand. But such elaboration into uniformity would hardly account for the strikingly dogmatic form of the sayings: 'And he began to teach them, that the Son of Man must suffer many things' [2]—the idea of dogmatic necessity could hardly be more strongly expressed. The subject is, not I, but 'the Son of Man'; and the words 'must suffer,' which meet us later in the preaching of the early missionaries,[3] point in the same direction. So that, whichever of the two main groups of 'Son of Man' passages we take, the result is the same: their predicates are best explained as analytic; they are steeped in dogma and divine necessity.

Yet further, the Son of Man must not only die, but

[1] Mark ix. 9-13.

[2] Mark viii. 31. This way of taking the words is strongly borne out by Mark ix. 12—'how is it written of the Son of Man, that he should suffer many things, and be set at nought?'

[3] Acts iii. 18 (St. Peter), xvii. 3 (St. Paul).

He must die for others. The vicarious character of His death is clearly enunciated in His own words: 'For the Son of Man came not to be ministered unto, but to minister, and to give his life a ransom for many.'[1] Naturally these verses have been widely suspected of Paulinism. Yet there is no need to reject them. They are in tune with their context; they help to account for the 'deliberate speed, majestic instancy' with which He moves to death; and they are echoed incontinently in the pages of the New Testament.[2] But in what sense was He to die for others? Why 'must' He die? It may well be that we should answer this question along many lines. For instance, it has been suggested that for Jesus the Kingdom only tarried until He Himself should be transformed, and that His death was the means to that;[3] or again, that His death would clinch the penitence which His preaching had elicited.[4] But, without ruling out either of these accounts of the matter, another and more complex one seems to be disclosed by the Lord Himself only a little later in the narrative —to wit, in the Parable of the Wicked Husbandmen.[5]

The parable does not end with the murder of the 'beloved son.' It ends with the declaration of what the lord of the vineyard will thereafter do. 'He will come and destroy the husbandmen, and will give the vineyard unto others.' And the Jews found the sting of the parable here: they took it as a threat of Judgment on themselves. But if it portended Judgment for the Jewish leaders, it portended also the coming of the

[1] Mark x. 45. Loisy and many others think it not genuine.

[2] Cf. Gal. i. 4; Rom. iv. 25; 1 Cor. xv. 3; 1 Tim. i. 15.

[3] Schweitzer. [4] Holtzmann

[5] Mark xii. 1-12. I owe the substance of this paragraph to an article by Professor Burkitt in the *American Journal of Theology*.

Kingdom for the elect. So far as they were concerned, the Son of Man's death would hasten their salvation; for it would directly necessitate the intervention of God. It was one of the commonplaces of the Jewish theology of the Kingdom that an extreme aggravation of iniquity —sometimes spoken of as the appearance of Antichrist —should precede and occasion God's vindication of Himself in Judgment and the deliverance of His people: it was the converse and parallel process to the repentance of the elect. This parable seems to suggest that, by challenging the heart of the Jewish Church in the Holy City, Jesus intended to force it to unmask its own deepest and most real tendencies; that so, when He had suffered the sharpness of death, God might act in Judgment and open the Kingdom of Heaven to all believers. And the notion of vicarious death was not unfamiliar to the Jewish history and religion. It underlies their sacrificial system; thence it passes over into the letters of St. Paul and the Epistle to the Hebrews; the readiness with which the New Testament writers speak of Christ as 'the Lamb' is proof of it.[1] And we have no reason to suppose that the mysticism of a St. John or a St. Peter was foreign to the mind of Jesus Himself.

There is one interpretation of His Office attributed to our Lord by the majority of modern theologians, which cannot be passed over in silence. He conceived of Himself, it is urged, as the Suffering Servant of Isaiah liii.; and it was in the conscious identification of the Son of Man with that figure that His original contribution to religion consists. The question here at issue is not easily answered. The evidence for this view

[1] John i. 29; 1 Peter i. 19; Rev. v. 6; Heb. ix. 14. Cf. Lev. xvi. 15; Num. xix. 2, 17, 18.

can be shortly summarised. It consists of three supposed references in the sayings of our Lord Himself, and a large number of references in the Acts and other books of the New Testament. Now the general principle has been accepted in this book that a strongly marked vein of thought in primitive Christianity probably has some roots in the teaching of Christ Himself. This is so naturally in cases where the records of His words support such a view—in the case of the eschatological teaching, for example. It is so also, though less obviously, in cases where the evidence from His own reported sayings is not strong, but where the presence of a doctrine in early Christianity is not otherwise explicable; as, for instance, in the case of the belief that penitence hastened the approach of the Kingdom. But at our present juncture neither of these sets of circumstances is to be found. It is very easy to explain how the first Christians should have interpreted their Master's death in the light of the Isaianic Song—more especially if He had dwelt at all on its vicarious side. On the other hand it is not easy to explain why His references to Isaiah liii. are so rare and ill-attested, if He really made them. If we take them seriatim, we shall see this. The voice at the Baptism is held to constitute such an allusion; but the words 'in thee I am well pleased,'[1] refer to Isaiah xlii.; and though we connect this with Isaiah liii., we do not know that Christ did so. The words 'for many' in the assertion of His vicarious death, quoted above, are supposed to echo the 'many' whom the Servant of Isaiah liii. shall justify;[2] but they are quite intelligible without this reference, as applying simply to the elect. Finally, the words of Jesus at the

[1] Mark i. 11. [2] Is. liii. 11; cf. Mark x. 45.

Last Supper, reported by St. Luke only, are adduced: 'For I say unto you, that this which is written must be fulfilled in me, And he was reckoned with transgressors.'[1] Yet the words fit ill here with the context, and many theologians would expunge them or take them as ironical. This is hardly adequate evidence on which to base the attribution to Jesus of the interpretation of His office given in type in Isaiah liii. It would be arbitrary, of course, to say that that chapter did not influence our Lord; but equally we have no right to claim that the notion of 'the Servant of the Lord' was fundamental to His consciousness in the same sense as that of 'the Son of Man.' The most that we can say is that Isaiah's picture in the Song of the Servant most probably helped our Lord to understand the bearing of His death upon the Kingdom and the Church, *after* He had resolved to die.

We cannot conclude this part of our inquiry better than by attempting to follow the historical sequence of the principal events in our Lord's ministry, as recorded by St. Mark, and of those parts of His teaching which bear directly upon it. No other method could show so clearly how close is the interaction between the two. It is only when interwoven with His actual life that the teaching of Christ can be seen in its full vital and dynamic significance; and, conversely, it is just His recorded teaching which gives to the record of His life the inward consistency which makes it intelligible to us. This is especially true of the Marcan record, on which the others are confessedly based. We shall therefore take that as our guide, supplementing from St. Matthew and St. Luke where they seem to fill in a gap or provide

[1] Luke xxii. 37; Is. liii. 12.

a necessary joint. Naturally we must content ourselves with an outline.

At the beginning of the Christian era, the religious atmosphere of Palestine was highly charged with expectations of the speedy coming of the Kingdom of God, when Israel's enemies should be scattered, and God should rule in righteousness and peace. The greater part of the Jews believed that His Kingdom should be realised upon earth, with its centre at Jerusalem, where Messiah of David's line should hold sway as God's vicegerent. But in certain circles, where greater pessimism prevailed, a new earth and a new heaven were looked for; and Messiah was conceived as a supernatural Being, coming in Judgment on the clouds at the conclusion of the age. He would consume the unrighteous, and would receive the worship of the elect of God in the Kingdom he inaugurated. Upon this world broke the voice of a prophet, John. He was roughly clad and lived ascetically; and he preached in the Judæan wilderness. The burden of his message was repentance. He warned men of approaching Judgment, giving it, however, a new and arresting character. The Jews' comfortable reliance on their descent from Abraham would avail them nothing: only moral repentance could give salvation in that day. Those who were moved by his appeal he baptized, as a token that their sins were washed away, and that they were thus eligible for the Kingdom. But he pointed to another baptism which was yet to come, which would be of the Spirit, not of water. A greater and holier than he should bring it; and that would be the immediate precursor of the Kingdom.

So striking was John's preaching that multitudes

flocked to hear him and to be baptized; and among them went Jesus. Two accounts say that John recognised in Him the greater one to whom he had pointed. Be that as it may, Jesus Himself at His Baptism received the conviction of the office He was to fulfil. He was to be Messiah, foretold of prophet and psalmist. We must believe that for many years—even from boyhood—He had lived in intimate communion with God, to whom He bore a relation unique among men. But the spiritual awakening which John caused first provided the occasion which drew Him to His public work, and revealed to Him the end to which His special Sonship was determined. At once He went away from the crowded river of baptism to be alone. There in the desert places, untrodden by men, beneath the sun and stars, He wrestled in Spirit over the deep issues His new call involved. He saw the battle ranged between God and His great Adversary for the sovereignty of the world. Satan as yet possessed it. He would keep it still, if he could but flaw the heart of the appointed Messiah. Let him blunt for a moment the spiritual point of the mission of Jesus, and swathe it in the claims of earthy needs; let him warp His faith in God, so that He should demand only the arbitrary and spectacular exercise of power; let him secure the homage of one instant as the price for the voluntary surrender of the world he owned: and the final victory was his. Thus was Jesus brought at once face to face with the full scope and immensity of His task, and with the yawning abyss of its dangers and temptations. In the strength of His firm hold on God, and on the revelation of His character in the Scriptures of the Jewish Church, He made His resolve, and laid down for Himself the principles of His ministry; and

at the close of His stern struggle[1] found the peace and joy of the presence of the company of heaven.

In St. Mark there follows here an interval; for he proceeds: 'Now after that John was delivered up, Jesus came into Galilee.' How long that interval may have been we do not know, nor what happened during it. But it is in just such implied intervals as this[2] that St. Mark leaves room, not only for matter which the other Synoptists have handed down to us, but also for such dealings as Jesus may have had at Jerusalem or in Samaria. Then he plunges at once into the central theme of Christ's message: 'The time is fulfilled, and the Kingdom of God is at hand: repent ye, and believe in the gospel.' Jesus, then, enters into and takes to Himself those expectations which had been called by the Baptist into living flame. He is indeed his successor; and He baptizes, not with water, but as John had foretold, with the Spirit. He is related to John both by similarity and by contrast. By similarity, because He, too, utters warning of approaching judgment, on cities and on individuals alike; and summons men to repent, if they would pass through it to the eternal life of the Kingdom. By contrast, because the manner of His life is different; and so, too, is His office in the destined scheme of events. The Baptist had lived in severe seclusion, and had been reproached for it as one possessed. Jesus entered into the social life around Him, and was the friend of all. His asceticism was inward, not outward, and His was the opposite reproach: 'Behold, a gluttonous man and a wine-bibber.' But

[1] We hardly need the evidence of *e.g.* Mark viii. 33; xiv. 36, to assure us that the Temptation was no passing agony.

[2] Cf. Mark ii. 23; iv. 1; x. 1.

the difference in their functions was the most marked. If they were willing to believe it, John was Elijah—that prophet whose return was to be the prelude of the coming of the Day of the Lord. Who then was Jesus Himself? If the Baptist were indeed Elijah, Jesus must be the Messiah. But the Jews did not draw the inference, nor even the disciples; the incongruity between Jesus and the Messiah of tradition was greater than John's congruity with Elijah. Even at a much later time, after they had realised the Christhood of Jesus, the Twelve did not see how John's fate at Herod's hands foreshadowed something similar for the Son of Man. But the importance of the Baptist for our Lord's understanding of His office is cardinal. It was the sanction to Him of His message that the Judgment and the Kingdom were at hand; for the first act in the drama was already played. And, when John had been killed, that event confirmed Him in the further conviction that He Himself must die.

This point of connexion once established between current expectation and historical fact, others were not slow to follow. Tradition had it that in the Day of Judgment the elect should be saved. But who were the elect? Predestined as they might be, they must yet be called out in readiness for their approaching change. Thus it is that the summons to repentance forms the first charge on our Lord's time in the early part of His ministry. And the response which it elicited gave Him double assurance that the Kingdom was at hand; the penitents were a storming party who were taking it by force. To give His call more concrete character, Jesus appealed for men to follow Him. They must count the cost; for it would mean forsaking all that they had and

loved. Yet it was worth while; for whatever place He had in the Kingdom would be shared in some sort with those who joined their lot with His. Only let there be no mistake as to the reality of their zeal for salvation. Not every one who said unto Him, 'Lord, Lord,' would enter the Kingdom, but those who were qualified for it in character. And in the instruction He gave to His followers He laid down the main principles of this qualification. The poor in spirit, the meek, the pure in heart, the peacemaker—these had it in their own right; others were entitled to enter the Kingdom in so far as they obeyed His call to turn from paths of evil to serve the living God. And what that meant was the inward devotion of the heart, earnestness, the love of God and of neighbour; not the meticulous observance of the letter of the Law, which so often did duty for religion.

As the urgency of the time grew more and more upon Him, Jesus appointed twelve to be with Him and assist Him in His task. They were the best of those whom He had called to follow Him; and now He sent them forth to preach and to cast out evil spirits. He told them, it would seem, that they should not have gone through the cities of Israel before the end should have come. The very fact of His own mastery over the devils was a sure sign of its immediate advent. For it meant that already the Kingdom of God was breaking in upon the Kingdom of Satan, and was ousting Him from the world He claimed to own. With its energies thus visibly astir, the Kingdom itself with all its glory could not be long delayed. Not long after, He sent out yet others, seventy in number, to throw the net of the Kingdom wider. And when they returned with joy, recounting their works of power, Jesus said that He 'beheld

Satan fallen as lightning from heaven.' There was no more widespread feature in the eschatological creed than this, that Beliar, the prince of the devils, should be bound at the coming of the Kingdom: this success of His disciples was the proof to Jesus that the Judgment and the Kingdom were verily at the doors—nay, that by anticipation they were already here.

The two forms of response which Jesus called for especially were repentance and faith. For these two spiritual activities were powerful to hasten on God's Kingdom. Repentance would speed its coming, since God could not inaugurate it until all the elect had been called out. Faith, manifesting itself in sacrifice, and wielding the weapon of importunate prayer, could bring the energies of the Kingdom into play here and now; and where they were active, the Kingdom itself could not lag far behind. Here, as elsewhere, we see how largely our Lord was governed by the tradition into which He was born.

Yet the point in which the floating dreams of Jewish expectations dropped most signally to earth in facts of history was in the identification of Himself by Jesus with the Son of Man. We do not know when He sealed that conception as expressive of His own office in this crisis of the world. It is possible that in the earlier part of His ministry, He spoke of the coming of the Son of Man, without implying His own identity with him; though such a hypothesis involves some transposition of the evidence. Be that as it may, it was not long before He realised that the Son of Man was none other than Himself. It was in that capacity that He forgave sins, and claimed the lordship of the Sabbath, and contrasted Himself with John. But to His hearers all the while the

title was enigmatical. If they had heard of a Son of Man, it was not of one who walked on earth, the son of humble parents, whose brothers and sisters were known. In some cases, when they heard Jesus speak of the Son of Man, they probably did not know that He was meaning Himself. In others, they were mystified by the title, and left it there. Whatever Jesus might denote by it, they had their own ideas as to who He might be—Elias, perhaps, or the Baptist risen from the dead, or one of the prophets. That He was the Messiah of this Kingdom which He preached could not have occurred to them. And Jesus was ready to have it so. His Messiahship had better remain a secret; since, if it were known that He claimed it, His work would be cut short. He needed time for finishing that; time, too, we may well think, for interpreting even to Himself the problems involved in His office. Herod, too, was becoming restive about this Prophet, and might do with Him as he had done with John. Thus, whenever His popularity with the masses seems to be waning, and His miracles might suggest that He was more than a prophet, we find Him seeking privacy. Now it was the lonely flanks of the hills to the east of the lake; at another it was the coasts of Tyre and Sidon. Moreover, two acts of His had specially endangered His secret. Twice, if the Marcan account be true, He had fed large multitudes, and on each occasion He had given to the meal a symbolic meaning. That bread which each then took was the token to them that they would have a place at Messiah's table in the Kingdom. It was not far from this to the inference that He who so dispensed to them was Himself the Messiah of the Kingdom.

Such at least was the conviction that did at last dawn

upon the most impetuous of the disciples. As they moved among the villages near Cæsarea Philippi, Jesus asked them in the way whom they took Him to be. The half of their schooling was now over: He could expect from them an answer different from that which was given by the common talk. 'Thou art the Christ.' But He charged them to tell no man. Peter had penetrated His secret by revelation of God; but it was not yet to be divulged further. Indeed this first confession of faith needed still to be amplified and enriched; it was but a tender shoot, though it contained the germ of all the future growth. And that further content He went on now to give it. This Son of Man, whose Christhood they had come to understand, must suffer and be restored again. He was the heavenly Messiah and Judge; but He must drink of a cup and be baptized with a baptism ere He should exercise His full prerogatives. He must be the Lord's Servant before He could be the Lord's Assessor. The change that He was to go through before He came in the glory of His Father with the holy angels was none other than the change of death. And it would seem that He was confirmed in this double function by a further revelation vouchsafed to Him and to His three most intimate disciples on the Mount of Transfiguration. A voice came from heaven, saying, 'This is my beloved Son,' and He was transfigured to their ecstatic gaze, as the Messiah of glory. But with Him were two others, Moses and Elijah—types of the Old Dispensation which had pointed forward to the new Age; yes, but types too of something else. Moses had seen the promised land and died before he entered it: Elijah had preached a second time through the lips of John the Baptist, and they had punished him with death.

Even so through death should the Son of Man enter upon His destined inheritance.

But why must He die? What historical necessity clinches the dogmatic? It was to speed the coming of the Kingdom. For all the happening of its preludes, it tarried still. Some crowning act was needed to call out in men the full measure of penitence and faith, and to stablish the elect, before the Son of Man could set up the Kingdom. The faith of His followers could not stand for too long the trial of hope deferred. The issues between God and the Adversary must be made so sharp and clear by the separation of all who were predestined that He could delay no longer.

> God for our own sake makes the need extreme,
> Till at the last He puts forth strength and saves.'[1]

And nothing is more strongly marked in these last chapters of the Second Gospel than the growing speed and intenseness of the Lord's actions and teaching. Two themes are constantly on His lips—the coming of the Son of Man in Judgment, and His suffering and death. His warnings of Judgment are more awful and arresting. He will come like a thief in the night: there will be no time to prepare escape or subterfuge: with unerring discrimination the one will be taken and the other left. Any sacrifice is worth while, if it ensures salvation in that day: 'It is good for thee to enter into life maimed than having two hands to go into hell, into the unquenchable fire.' And likewise any the least act of kindness or forgiveness will avail in the other balance. A cup of cold water to one who is Christ's—the repudiation of any grudge against another; these shall bring a man

[1] Browning, *The Ring and the Book*.

peace at the last. So searching will be the Judgment of the Son of Man.

And together with this sounds the note of His own death. Not once, nor twice, but often He points forward to it as His inevitable end. And He combines it plainly with the thought of sovereignty. When the sons of Zebedee ask for high position in His Kingdom, He tells them that lordship means something different there from what it does on earth. Earth's sovereignty is but a hollow make-believe: with His disciples it shall be otherwise. It is through service that they shall attain to rule; their authority shall be interior and spiritual, instead of exterior and titular. Yet it shall be real. They shall sit on twelve thrones judging the new Israel of the future. And what of His own sovereignty as Son of Man? 'He came not to be ministered unto, but to minister'—an example which was to stimulate service in them. But their service was to be the medium of their rule. Can we think but that He had already drawn the inference for Himself, that in His supreme service of death His sovereignty too was to meet its consummation?

At any rate the meaning of it all would soon be clear. 'Of that hour and that day' God knew alone; but He would know too when His earthly office was fulfilled. The faith He walked by was sufficient to lead Him until knowledge came. He went to Jerusalem for the Feast, when all that was most distinctive in the Jewish Church found exercise and expression. He rode into the city as Zechariah had said that Messiah should ride—meek and lowly, and upon an ass's colt. But none recognised Him for the Christ. He was 'the prophet' of Galilee, and they hailed Him in the language used to

welcome all the pilgrims : ' Blessed is he that cometh in the name of the Lord.' And straightway He launched attack upon the Jewish leaders. He cleansed the Temple of the sacrilegious traffickers who were carrying on their trade in its precincts ; He revealed to the scribes who asked after His credentials just as much, and just as little, of Himself as might come within the vision of those who had not known how to appraise John the Baptist ; He rendered nugatory the traps of Pharisees and Sadducees, answering their questions with appeals to first principles which put them to open shame ; in the parable of the Vineyard He held up to view the treatment which the Jewish hierarchy had loved to mete out to God's prophets, and which they were so shortly to mete out to His only Son. Thus was the pyre prepared, which only needed the spark. And it had not long to wait. From the meal which Jesus ate with His disciples one of their number, Judas, went out and betrayed Him for a price. We do not know what it was that he betrayed ; but it was probably that secret of the Messiahship, which Jesus had enjoined on the Twelve so strictly to preserve : and thus Judas gave the Jewish leaders just the evidence they needed. They could accuse Him of blasphemy ; they could, moreover, win the crowd to their side, when they should discover that this prophet whom they had believed in had made the preposterous claim to be Himself God's Christ ; and they could work on Pilate's fear of disturbance, which the presence of a Messianic claimant was so likely to cause. The death of Jesus was now only a matter of hours.

He Himself meanwhile had given His last charge. In a discourse on the Mount of Olives, as He sat with four

disciples, fronting the splendid Temple, which was just reaching its completion, He foretold its speedy destruction; and He bade them watch without ceasing, for the Son of Man would come now they knew not how soon. That vision of the end of the Kingdom, which had been 'the master-light of all His seeing,' hovered more closely; most, if not all, of its preliminaries had already been translated into fact; there remained only the crowning manifestation of the Son of Man, accomplishing Judgment and inaugurating the Kingdom. And two days later, as He sat at board with His disciples, He repeated once again the sacramental act which He had first wrought by the Sea of Galilee. But now there was a difference. For the bread and the wine, which He set apart for His symbolic purpose, were not only the tokens which should admit them to His banquet in the Kingdom; they were also significant of His Body which should be slain, His Blood so soon to be outpoured; and as such they were to keep His chosen ones in mind that soon He would come again. Then, after a hymn, they went out to the Mount of Olives. In the Garden of Gethsemane He passed through great agony of soul: must He indeed drink the cup to the dregs, before His Christhood could be achieved? The faith that had led Him through so much shrank for a moment from this last demand on it. Yet it did not fail; and in its victory new light was vouchsafed, which showed to Him how His death was indeed bound closer than He had ever quite avowed with His glory. 'And the high priest said unto him, I adjure thee by the living God, that thou tell us whether thou be the Christ, the Son of God. Jesus saith unto him, Thou hast said: nevertheless I say unto you, Henceforth ye shall see the Son of Man sitting

at the right hand of power, and coming on the clouds of heaven.'[1] Henceforth!—so it was no longer future. The future had passed into the present, vision into fact, in this case as in so many others. His death was His glory and the world's Judgment; and when He had overcome its sharpness, He would open the Kingdom of heaven to all believers. And so He passed to Calvary a victor. He would die on the Cross; but from it He would begin to reign.

[1] This is the record in the First Gospel, and St. Luke differs but little: both have the 'henceforth.' St. Mark omits that word. But its genuineness can hardly be doubtful. We know that St. Luke at any rate had a Passion-narrative of his own, by which he supplemented that of St. Mark; and if this Passion-narrative were, as some scholars believe, part of Q, this would be a good instance of the fusion of the two sources in the First Gospel. As to the interpretation of the passage, I am not perhaps overbold in suggesting one of my own, as the Synoptic scholars all find great difficulty in the word 'henceforth,' and none of them give any explanation of it which they consider satisfactory. See Montefiore's note on Matt. xxvi. 64. I published this suggested explanation in an unsigned article entitled 'Eschatology and the Kingdom of Heaven' in the *Church Quarterly Review* for October 1909. The same, or a very similar, explanation was arrived at by Mr. Temple independently: cf. *The Kingdom of God*, p. 36.

CHAPTER VI

THE KINGDOM AND THE CHURCH

THE outline of the teaching of Christ given in the foregoing chapter raises a very crucial question. We have seen that, like many a prophet and apocalyptist of old, He looked for the sudden and immediate coming of the Kingdom of Heaven—a new order of things, transcendental and eternal, which formed the focus of His thoughts and the main burden of His preaching. The object of His ministry was to evoke faith and repentance, that those who repented and believed might prepare to enter the Kingdom. Those who responded He knit in a new fellowship, communicating to them His own knowledge of God as Father, stimulating within them an almost paradoxical love towards their brethren, and teaching them to pray. Whether He spoke of these elect as His Church or not we cannot be sure; but at least He seems to have given them the lineaments of a definite form. The Twelve act as intermediaries between Him and them, with Simon Peter in a position of primacy among them: He gives them sacraments or pledges of their common calling: and He can even speak of them proleptically—so assured is their vocation—under the title of the Kingdom of God. Most striking of all the elements in His teaching—and all the more so as it is incidental—is what He says about Himself. On the

one hand, He stands in a relation of unique intimacy and reciprocal knowledge with God: He is 'the Son' or 'the Son of God.' On the other, He is, although men do not know it, that 'Son of Man' who is to appear in heavenly Judgment and to inaugurate the Kingdom. Yet no sooner have the disciples come to acknowledge His Messiahship than He warns them of the path that He must tread towards its attainment. 'The Son of Man must suffer.' From this point onwards the narrative is marked by a peculiar pressure and intensity, as though expressing the 'deliberate speed, majestic instancy' with which Christ courted death. The two lines of necessity which He had predicted—His glorious destiny, and His humiliation and death—seem to converge; and as they converge, to absorb more and more of the whole series of religious issues which He had raised; the future coming of the Kingdom is subsumed into the destiny of the Christ; until they meet in the fateful words spoken before Caiaphas.

The problem that arises hence is fairly clear. It lies in the apparent discrepancy between our Lord's predictions and the facts of history. He foretold immediate catastrophe—an act of divine Judgment, and the establishment of a new era with new conditions of life for believers; and the rest of His teaching is focused round this central expectation. The problem is double-edged. We must ask on the one hand what is the relation of this religion of Jesus to the Christianity of the Church. How did the first become the second? Was the translation so true that the Christ of history can still be the Christ of faith? And on the other hand the problem has a close bearing on our conception of Christ's Person. If His predictions were falsified in the event,

it is hard to acquit Him of radical error, and of such an element of fancy as we might condone in a prophet, but could scarcely reconcile with the Incarnate Son of God. We cannot accept the ready solution of many modern writers,[1] who maintain that the eschatological sayings only show that Jesus was a man of His age, not exempt from the limitations of its thought and language, and that we should look elsewhere—to His ethical teaching, for instance, and His criticism of the Law—for the kernel of His message. Historically this position is unsound; and it cannot recommend itself to those who realise that the more recondite sayings of a great religious teacher are those which are most likely to contain His deepest truths. Moreover, in the case before us, the parables and the other eschatological parts of our Gospels have been vitalising forces in Christendom quite as much as the Sermon on the Mount. Nor can we, with other writers,[2] attribute them solely to the prophetic consciousness of Jesus, which, true to its type, foreshortened the intervening distance of time, and set the events of the last day in the immediate future. There is much in this suggestion which is helpful; and it is worth noting how in all times of religious intensity in Christendom men have expected that the end of the world was near, and have been much uplifted by this belief. But by itself this explanation would mean that Jesus carried out His ministry and went to His death under a delusion. Put in this unambiguous form, it creates as many difficulties as it purports to dispel.

An attempt to cope with the problem from yet another point of view was made by Father Tyrrell in *Christianity at the Cross-Roads*. Treating religious language as

[1] Schmiedel, Bacon, and others.

[2] *E.g.* Harnack.

highly symbolic, he maintains that just as the Hebrew mind figured the transcendent as something above in space, so it figured it also as something future in time. But the suggestion is not verifiable in the language of the Old Testament; we cannot thus turn the time-category into a symbol. When Jesus says that He expects something to happen, we must take Him at His word. It behoves us, then, to see whether we can find some more adequate explanation to account for the facts.

The value of Father Tyrrell's book lies in this: that he did at least try to do justice to the fact of Christianity as well as to the fact of Christ. It is just here where liberal Protestant theology fails. It has given us a picture of Jesus, which, even if it explained the records of His life in the Gospels, could never explain how Christianity as an historic religion sprang from that Person. It leaves Christ and Christianity as disparate and mutually alien elements. It is not a question of whether historic Christianity has been right or wrong: it is a question of whether devotion to the Person whom Protestant criticism has given us (or should we say 'to any of the persons'?) could have produced an Augustine or a Francis. Let us remember again, that no account of the life and teaching of Christ, based on the Gospels, can be adequate, unless it does justice to the lives of the saints as well as to the evangelic records. We have got to explain the teaching of Jesus about the Kingdom in such a way as not to make Church history unintelligible.

Now it must have become clear that we have been dealing with a complex of conceptions, which, though they presented themselves to Jesus as a whole, and can be subsumed under one name, the Kingdom of Heaven,

yet none the less contained divers factors or constituents —Judgment by the Son of Man, Resurrection, the assembly of the elect of all ages and peoples, and the session of the Son of Man by 'the right hand of power.' This Kingdom Jesus expected to come suddenly and soon. But here a loophole of escape presents itself. The evidence does not entitle us to say that Jesus expected *all* the elements in His hope of the Kingdom to be realised directly. He does not indeed distinguish them clearly; but neither does He insist upon their coincidence. Moreover, a very important consideration becomes now relevant. Jesus Himself confesses a large measure of ignorance. 'But of that day or that hour,' He says, 'knoweth no one, not even the angels in heaven, neither the Son, but the Father.' If this open disowning on Christ's part of any detailed knowledge about the great day be taken at its face-value, the simultaneity of the various factors of the end implied in His teaching is easily accounted for: He could not distinguish, where He did not know. And so these factors appear in His teaching bound together in the coincidence which tradition had given them.[1] Yet at the same time we on our side are absolved from a rigorous adherence to this coincidence. No dogmatic loyalties or timidities need deter us from separating elements which Christ handled together, seeing that this common handling sprang from no prevision on His part. We are free to slide this back, that forward. To use a grammatical metaphor, it is quite possible that just as the twin expectations of

[1] See chap. I. pp. 13-15. Cf. 2 Thess. i. 5-10; 1 Thess. i. 10; iii. 13; iv. 17; Acts iii. 19-21; x. 43—all primitive allusions, belonging to a time anterior to the 'separating' process spoken of in the text.

His death and of His glory were joined in a zeugma, so the constituent factors in the latter hope were severed, in point of fact, in a hendiadys.

A further meaning may legitimately be found in our Lord's confession of ignorance—namely, His sense of the inadequacy of the thought-forms which were at His disposal for the expression of the truths He had to teach. Jesus was to this extent of His own day, that only the religious conceptions available to His contemporaries were available to Himself. By available conceptions we do not mean merely those of which men actually availed themselves: we must be careful not to confine Jesus to the language of the apocalyptic books, seeing that He was conversant with the whole library of the Old Testament; and so He could always correct and enlarge the local and transient by the appeal to the classical. But at least He could not overleap in His thought-forms the bounds of the Hebraic. The Hebrew mind loved the most concrete imagery: it clothed its theological and moral ideas, however transcendental, in highly pictorial language; taking figures from the glories of nature or the intimacies of social life to be vehicles of the sublimest truths. In the prophetic times the forms of imagery are various and elastic: by the age of our Lord they have become more stereotyped and fixed, and their symbolic character is probably forgotten. But, throughout, the Hebraic love of the concrete and pictorial is clear, and in this our Lord is no exception to the rule. What distinguishes Him from His contemporaries is not the use of different and larger categories; but rather that, using the same, He felt their inadequacy, while the rest did not.

With this in mind we shall not press too closely the

actual details of our Lord's predictions. Let us take, for instance, His prophecy of the Son of Man coming with the clouds. When the author of the Book of Daniel wished to speak of the Judgment, he set forth the figure of 'one like a son of man' coming 'with the clouds of heaven,' and being invested with 'dominion and glory and a kingdom.' Later writers, particularly the author of the Book of Enoch, adopted this picture, and, so to speak, materialised it; until in our Lord's time the phrase 'the Son of Man . . . coming with the clouds' can have had only one meaning: it signified the Judgment. When, therefore, our Lord made this prediction, He need have meant nothing more than the imminent Judgment. His literal appearance on the clouds is not called for. His words will be fulfilled in any act or event wherein God or His Messiah settles the spiritual destinies of men, and the principles of God's ultimate triumph are finally vindicated.

We are prepared, then, alike by the real content of our Lord's expectations and by the indications He gives us of His own apprehension of them, to find their fulfilment complex. We shall be satisfied that His faith was justified as true, if some event or events happened immediately which may be taken as decisive for man's spiritual history; if the germs of a new kind of life and the principles of a new process were introduced at once into the world; if a fellowship between God and men, and of men with one another, hitherto only adumbrated and imagined, were now instituted as a fact; if a new and redeemed Israel were established, over which the Apostles might rule. We do not require that the whole process should be completed in a trice; but we do need to be sure that all the potentialities of future develop-

ment should be present at the beginning. And for evidence we can but turn to Christian experience, which finds its normative expression in the New Testament. What have the authors of these books to say? Do they write like men who feel that the Judgment is behind them, and that the Kingdom of God has come? And do they think of Christ as invested with the same high and awful prerogatives which He foretold for Himself? Finally, is there any echo of that note of delay which, as we saw,[1] our Lord seems sometimes to have sounded when speaking of the Kingdom? Do they still look forward? The answers to these questions should either provide us with the materials for the solution of our problem, or else go far towards proving it insoluble.

Now, if we turn to the apostolic writers of our New Testament, we find frequently attested the consciousness of being members of a new order, to which only now in these latter days has admission been possible to men. St. Paul speaks expressly of Christians being part of a 'new creation,' and of a long hidden 'mystery,' which has at last been revealed; while St. John explains how believers have 'passed from death unto life.' Old things have passed away: all has become new. Everywhere there is the sense of a new relation to God and a new outlook on the world. We have in fact a new dispensation, a new religion.

And if we analyse still further this new religion—its faith and its ideas—we find it to be a complex of different elements, which however all contain one common factor—Christ. He is the beginning and the end of them all. Whether they look at the present, or at the past, or at the future, He is the central feature of what they

[1] See chap. II. pp. 35-37.

see, the sun of all their world. Yet the distinction of time just drawn is a real one. They do look back to the past, forward to the future, and around, above, and within them in the present. Behind them there is the fact of the Death and Resurrection of Jesus, so overwhelming in itself as to throw the rest of His life into comparative oblivion. With them is the ever-present Christ, the Son of God—He in them and they in Him through His Spirit. It is true that at first they did not so explain their experience. In St. Paul's earliest letters, the Epistles to the Thessalonians, the emphasis is still upon His future coming, to judge and to inaugurate His Kingdom. But soon the stress changes, and falls more and more upon a Divine Person who is already active in the midst of the believers. They are already justified, already members of the Kingdom, already sharing the new life of fellowship with God and His Messiah in the Church. Finally, they still look for a consummation in the future. St. Paul regards it as a 'filling up' of Christ through the extension of the Church: the author of the Book of Revelation, saturated as he is in apocalyptic forms of thought, draws a picture of the great Assize at Christ's advent, when the wicked shall be cast into hell, and the redeemed shall enjoy everlastingly their heavenly rest. The past, the present, and the future—all three go to form the complex object of the primitive Christian faith.

These three aspects of early Christian thought, which together form its orientation, may well be studied one by one. What we want is to see the connexion of each with the teaching of Christ, and in each to trace such development as there may be. But while each stream flows separately, they pass through parallel filter-beds;

and it is in these that they are most conveniently analysed. First come the letters of St. Paul ; where the background of Jewish apocalyptic dogma is filled in with the riches of the Apostle's mystical experience. Next follow the Johannine writings. Their author too is a Jew. But he is a Jew well versed in Alexandrian philosophy ; and it is from this standpoint that he approaches Christ. St. Paul finds in Jesus the Messiah he had hoped for, St. John the Word he had mused on. Further, St. John has half a century more of Christian experience behind him than St. Paul. In him the tempest of conversion has had time to subside, and he has been able to sound and chart for us the great deeps of the new life which Christ has brought. The result is an account of Christ, not always historical perhaps in an external and chronological sense ; but historical fundamentally, in the sense that Christ actually was what in the Fourth Gospel He and the Evangelist say that He was. St. Paul preached Christ : St. John interpreted Him. And, though for the form and the immediate meaning of His teaching we may well confine ourselves to the Synoptic record, yet its permanent and underlying significance is revealed in the Gospel of St. John. When we have followed Christianity from the teaching of Christ as recorded in the Synoptic Gospels to St. Paul, and from St. Paul to the Fourth Gospel, we find that the curve on which we have been moving is one that returns upon itself.

1. Take first the element of retrospect. The two salient events to which St. Paul looks back are the Death and Resurrection of Christ. It has often been pointed out that St. Paul never dwells upon Christ's death without going on to emphasise the fact that He has risen again. And the reason is that it is the Resurrection which demon-

strates the significance of the Cross. That proved that on the Cross He had abolished death and conquered sin and delivered His people : [1] in the light of the Resurrection His death could be seen to have been, not a failure, but a triumph.[2] Thus it is that both His Resurrection and His Death are spoken of as the objective ground of our justification.[3] They are not two grounds, but one, the second fact drawing out all the implicates for life and history of the first.

Now all these aspects of Christ's death—the conquest of sin and death, the deliverance, the triumph—are inseparable in Jewish eschatological thought from the notion of the Judgment by Messiah ; but with none of them is the connexion closer than in the case of justification. This is not the place, nor is it necessary for our argument, to enter into the controversial question of the meaning of the word ' justify ' and its cognates in St. Paul's letters. What is clear on any showing is that St. Paul could not speak of Christians as already ' justified,' unless in some sense an act of Judgment was already passed. That act of Judgment St. Paul finds in the death of Christ. There may be another to come ; indeed the Apostle often speaks of a future appearing of Christ, which will mean the punishment of the enemies of God. But from that Christians will have nothing to fear ; for them it will be only formal ; according to the measure of their acceptance of His death, their Judgment is already over.

The connexion of Christ's death with Judgment is one that we have to deduce from St. Paul's writings rather

[1] 2 Tim. i. 10 ; Rom. vi. 1-11 ; Tit. ii. 14. (No opinion is meant to be expressed on the authorship of the Pastoral Epistles. Here at least they are Pauline, if not St. Paul's.)

[2] Col. ii. 14. [3] Rom. iii. 24, 25 ; iv. 24, 25.

than find patent in them. He is more concerned with justification than with Judgment. That which was a dogma of his expectation when he was a Jew has become now suffused with, and resolved into, the living experience of the Christian life. That men have been judged is of less moment than that believers are justified ; and the meaning and interests of the new estate tend more and more to occupy a preponderating place in the Apostle's thoughts. Hence it is to St. John that we should turn for more light upon the manner of this connexion. Not only does he state explicitly that Judgment is passed when he says : 'He that believeth on Him is not judged : he that believeth not hath been judged already, because he hath not believed on the name of the only begotten Son of God.' [1] But he amplifies the point ; he interprets it ; he reads it into the whole story of Christ. It has often been pointed out that the Fourth Gospel exhibits a sharpness of antithesis between our Lord and 'the world,' which is not to be found in the Synoptic Gospels. We have noted in an earlier chapter how Jesus regarded His people as in the grip of diabolic power. But in St. John the reaction of Jesus upon mankind is heightened into the tragic conflict of ultimate spiritual systems. He prepares us for it in the Prologue to the Gospel, where he enunciates the fundamental opposition of light and darkness, and it is on this battleground that He sees Christ move. 'The world' hates Him, because He testifies of it, that its works are evil : it cannot receive His Spirit of Truth, because it does not behold or know Him : and it will hate His disciples, because they have been separated from it and are not of it. And what is this but a process of Judgment ? 'This is judgment,

[1] John iii. 18.

that the light is come into the world, and men loved the darkness rather than the light; for their works were evil.' [1]

Further, St. John draws out the significance of Christ as Judge. The Father has given all judgment to the Son, and committed to Him all authority to judge, because He is 'a son of man.' [2] The words are significant. The characteristic title of the Lord is dropped; the grandiose and spectacular associations of Judgment are set aside; it is to One who is completely human that men owe account. Not by a standard that is beyond men's imagination does Christ measure His decrees, but by one that their own highest aspirations have foreshadowed. And so, for St. John, Messiah's glory—that glory which prophets, and still more apocalyptists, had painted so royally in their pictures of His appearing—is revealed upon the Cross. It is shortly before the Last Supper, during the week of the Feast, that the Lord declares it plainly. 'The hour is come, that the Son of Man should be glorified.' 'Now is the judgment of this world: now shall the prince of this world be cast out.' [3] And He leaves no doubt of His meaning, when He continues: 'And I, if I be lifted up from the earth, will draw all men unto me': for He spoke it, signifying by what manner of death He should die. At the time when Jesus uttered before Caiaphas the words that, humanly speaking, sealed His fate in the trial: 'Thou hast said: nevertheless I say unto you, Henceforth ye shall see the Son of Man sitting at the right hand of power, and coming on the clouds of heaven,' few, if any, knew what He meant by 'henceforth.' The Church had lived long enough, when St. John wrote, to understand.

[1] John iii. 19. [2] John v. 27. [3] John xii. 23, 31.

The belief in Christ's Judgment from the Cross is not complete without reference to the action of the Spirit. In the Johannine discourses, it is said of the Spirit that 'He, when He is come, will convict the world in respect of sin, and of righteousness, and of judgment: of sin, because they believe not on me; of righteousness, because I go to the Father, and ye behold me no more; of judgment, because the prince of this world hath been judged.' Christ crucified is Judge, because in Him is the full revelation in human history of the love of God. But it is the Spirit who brings home to men its reality for their own lives, and keeps it constantly before them. The records of religious experience are full of this awfulness of the divine love. If this were but remembered, we should find the love of God spoken of less frequently as though it were a mild and comfortable thing. In truth, whatever attributes of power and awe have been given in the world's poetry or prose—in Sophocles or Plato, in Petrarch or Browning—to human love belong tenfold more to divine love as it is revealed in the Bible. The conceptions of God as jealous, as mighty to save, as a consuming fire, as wroth against sin, spring from the experience of His pursuing love. There is nothing that so rebukes us as sacrifice, which is Love's raiment amid wrong-doing and injustice; nothing that so shames us as humility, which is Love's fiery glance; nothing which so makes us tremble as patience, which is Love's urgency. Where Christ's Spirit is these things are seen; and, when we see them, we confess Christ as our Judge.

2. In Jewish expectation, the Judgment was to be the prelude to the inauguration of the Kingdom. There is nothing in our Lord's teaching which tends to sever this close connection, but much to confirm it; and He pro-

claims that the advent of the new age is at hand. It is true that sometimes He seems to contemplate delay in the realisation of events, and we must bear this in mind. But the note of immediacy is the pervading one. Hence we must ask what light the experience of the early Church throws on the fulfilment of His predictions. Did the Kingdom come ?

We cannot read the New Testament Epistles without feeling that we have here once again, after a lapse of centuries, the classical spirit of the prophetic books. The same elation of faith, the same paradox of triumph through adversity, breathe through the pages of both. Yet there is a difference. Where the prophets had spoken with the inspiration of hope, the Apostles write from the certainty of experience. In their visions of the Kingdom the prophets had set all righteousness and rejoicing : sorrow and sin should flee away. Then they might beat their swords into plowshares, and their spears into pruning-hooks, and the lion and the lamb should lie down together. They who seemed to be rejected should become sons of the living God : the name of their city should be 'the Lord is there.' And now for the Christian Church all these things have become a reality. 'The kingdom of heaven is . . . righteousness and peace and joy in the Holy Ghost,' [1] says St. Paul, summarising, as by accident, the leading elements of his message—the righteousness that has come, not by the law, but by faith ; the peace between Jew and Gentile, reconciled in Christ ; the joy that springs from common cause in the fellowship of the Spirit. For him, the sonship of Hosea's prophecy is a fact ; for 'as many as are led by the Spirit of God, these are sons of God,' [2] having

[1] Romans xiv. 17. [2] Romans viii. 14, 15.

received the spirit of adoption, whereby they cry, Abba, Father. And their mother is the new Jerusalem,[1] which is above, and to which, for the writer of the Epistle to the Hebrews, they have already come.[2] If there be any sincerity in the apostolic writers, they mean that the Kingdom of Heaven is already established.

Yet when St. Paul comes to doctrine, he is careful to temper his language, and not to create the impression that the Kingdom is established *in its entirety*. Christians have the Spirit among them; and the Spirit is the 'earnest' of their inheritance.[3] The word is carefully chosen. It is not any kind of token, but a particular kind—namely, the first instalment of the whole amount which is claimed and expected. The Kingdom is here, that is, yet not all of it. A place is disclosed for development and progress. What the term of that development is we will discuss later. Here, however, we may remind ourselves of the antinomy in the teaching of our Lord, which we left unsolved—of the fact that, while commonly He spoke of the advent of the Kingdom as immediate, there are passages where He seems to provide for delay. We need not think that He foresaw the exact succession of events: but the antinomy finds its justification in fact, if the Kingdom came in part immediately and in part were deferred. The prophetic mind especially did not easily move in the category of progress; it saw rather the beginning and the end: and we need not be afraid to believe that in such a respect Jesus was a prophet.

Some such view as this seems required if we consider

[1] Gal. iv. 26. [2] Heb. xii. 22.

[3] Eph. i. 14. Cf. 2 Cor. i. 22, v. 5, where the genitives are surely qualitative.

again the substance of the eschatological discourse, which was touched upon in the second chapter. We saw there how our Lord spoke, like the prophets before Him, of a double Judgment—a 'political' and local one seen upon the background of a much vaster, cosmic, catastrophe; and it is probable that His language conveyed the impression that the second would follow hard upon the first.[1] But there is a real difficulty in supposing that our Lord *thought* of the two as closely connected in time. For it has been pointed out that the holding of two such expectations with regard to the immediate future, when the one of them is immeasurably greater than the other, is psychologically almost incredible. 'If the final consummation of all things was to come in that generation, one would have expected that that event, being one of so far surpassing importance, would have held the prominent place in the mind of Jesus, and that the downfall of Jerusalem, and the circumstances connected with it, would have been altogether eclipsed, dwarfed into insignificance by the greater and more tremendous world-comprising event.'[2]

We can thus take up the question left over from the earlier chapter. The 'day' to which our Lord pointed forward in His teaching did come suddenly, like a thief in the night, in so far as it came in that series of events which form the core of the Christian Gospel—the Cross, the Resurrection, Pentecost. But in so far as the coming of the Son of Man included also the final con-

[1] The evidence seems clear upon this point: cf. Mark xiii. 24 (in three days), Matt. xxiv. 29 (immediately after the tribulation of three days). Luke xxi. 25 has no note of time.

[2] I quote from an article in *Comment and Criticism* (November 1914) by the Rev. C. K. Parez, to whom I am indebted for the substance of this paragraph. The whole article is worth attention.

summation of all things and the unveiling of His full glory, it was preluded by signs and troubles throughout the years, and prominent among these was the destruction of Jerusalem. Both strands of His teaching are therefore verified, since they refer to different parts of, or moments in, the same new dispensation.

Closely allied with the experience of the Holy Spirit, and equally clear evidence that the Kingdom is felt to be already present, is the way in which the apostolic writers speak of the Church. We saw in the third chapter how our Lord regarded those who repented at His preaching and followed Him as elect and separate from the rest of the world, and how He left with them, in St. Peter and the other disciples, the rudiments of organisation. They were those who were marked out by baptism, and perhaps by the partaking of a symbolic meal, for places in the regenerate twelve tribes of Israel. But, when we come to the Epistles, the new Israel has been established. It is described in the First Epistle of St. Peter in a passage whose every word is packed with prophetic reminiscences. Believers 'are built up a spiritual house, to be a holy priesthood, to offer up spiritual sacrifices, acceptable to God through Jesus Christ.'[1] They are 'an elect race, a royal priesthood, a holy nation, a people for God's own possession . . . the people of God'[2]—in a word, as St. Paul calls them, 'the Israel of God.'[3] What may yet be in store for believers does not blind them to the privileges which as members of the Kingdom they already enjoy.

St. Paul makes the Church still more the fulfilment of Messianic hope, when he describes it as 'the body of Christ,' and speaks of its members as 'in Christ.' We

[1] 1 Peter ii. 5. [2] 1 Peter ii. 9, 10. [3] Gal. vi. 16.

are so accustomed to the phrases that we do not easily realise their original meaning—'the body of Messiah,' 'in Messiah.' Yet to those who knew the Jewish hope, as most religiously-minded persons did in the Græco-Roman world, the words must have appealed with amazing force. They could not be 'in Messiah' if He had not come, and if they did not know who He was. We may perhaps reasonably ask whence St. Paul got this his characteristic expression. Possibly it was one of those coinages to which new and overwhelming experiences not infrequently give rise. But there is another suggestion which is worth considering. In the Book of Daniel, the figure of 'one like unto a son of man' is the image of 'the saints' who shall possess the Kingdom; that is to say, it is a representative or collective figure. Since then it had become a title, and had been used as such by our Lord. But in the significance of the title St. Paul may well have felt that this piece of symbolism in the Book of Daniel played a part. The figure of the vision had taken flesh and blood in Jesus, and was now brought near to the Ancient of Days. But likewise it had taken body in the saints of the Most High, who were the Church; so that members of the Church might be most aptly spoken of as 'in Christ.'

Yet again, to be 'in Christ' was scarcely distinguishable for St. Paul from being in the Kingdom of Heaven. He thanks God, because He has 'blessed us with every spiritual blessing in the heavenly places in Christ.'[1] The sphere of the blessing is there, 'in the heavenly places,' because that is where Christ is believed to be. The position which St. Paul ascribes to Christ is exactly that which He had ascribed to Himself before Caiaphas.

[1] Eph. i. 3.

St. Paul did see the Son of Man 'at the right hand of power'; [1] the formula at the trial is almost an epitome of His Christology. Hence it is natural to speak of Him as 'Lord'—a title used in the Old Testament of Jehovah only. And no heightening process or development takes place, when St. Paul gives to Him in the later Epistles attributes that are more obviously divine.[2] There is no more here than is involved in the translation of ideas from one set of thought-forms to another. Moreover, there is no discontinuity in the history of Christ's Person Himself. St. Paul never thinks of His having become Divine after His Resurrection and Ascension in a sense in which He was not before. 'Now this, He ascended, what is it but that He also descended into the lower parts of the earth? He that descended is the same also that ascended far above all the heavens.' [3] So far as St. Paul works out the bearing of Christ's Office upon His Person —and if he does not do so more fully, it is because he always writes as pastor rather than as theologian—the result is the Christology of the Christian Creeds.

And here, before we pass on to St. John's testimony to the presence of the Kingdom, it may be well to touch upon an obvious difficulty that must present itself. Looking to the frequent lapses from the standard of Christ which have marked the Church's history, and which marked it even in the apostolic age, how are we to see in it the Kingdom of God? What has the Kingdom to do with schism, and worldliness, and privilege? The answer may be sought along the lines of Christ's teaching. We remember that He had sometimes used the phrase 'the Kingdom of God' in a proleptic sense,

[1] Romans viii. 34.

[2] *E.g.* Eph. i. 10; Phil. ii. 9, 10; Col. i. 15-20. [3] Eph. iv. 9.

covering those who by their natural character or by their repentance were destined for the Kingdom, and as justified by the manifest display of its powers and blessings.[1] He used it, in fact, of those who followed Him, of the infant Church. Moreover, even in that time, there were tares among the wheat, bad fish mingled with the good; and yet He could still speak of them as 'the kingdom.' But much more so was this natural after the Lord's Ascension and the outpouring of the Spirit. We can, if we like, say that the Apostles could still only speak of the Kingdom as present in a proleptic sense, and in one way we should be right. All was not yet complete. But there is a difference between the Church of the Apostles and the Church of the Lord's own lifetime, and one which makes the use of the term 'the kingdom of God' and its cognates no longer a *façon de parler*. More and more since Pentecost the balance of emphasis in the Christian outlook had shifted from the element of hope to the element of experience; what they had already of the blessings of the Kingdom was so splendid a foretaste of the whole that it preoccupied them more and more. They began like men who stand upon a hill-top in the morning mist, and in front of them, seeming full close across the intervening folds of cloud, rises the peak of their desires, tipped with the first shafts of the dawn. Then in a trice the sun is up, and melted are the clouds; and as they melt, the distance of the peak is more and more disclosed; and the object of their hopes, once so immediate and near, recedes and still recedes. Yet there is no disappointment, no sickening of heart. For that same sun has laid bare the glory wherein their own feet are set, and shown them that they are on a

[1] See chap. I. pp. 27, 28.

ridge of the very height which they would climb. So the Church still has its march, with all the chance of faintness and mistake; but the way is clear, and the consummation of the journey sure. Or, to leave the simile, there are astir in the Church, and have been since the first days, with whatever commixture of evil, spiritual energies that come from God, and are slowly transforming humanity into a worthy citizenhood of His eternal Kingdom.

The last stage of the New Testament conception of the Kingdom as present is represented by the Johannine writings. The phrase 'the kingdom of God' or 'the kingdom of heaven' occurs in them only twice; though on three other occasions in the Fourth Gospel Jesus speaks of 'my kingdom.' Its place is taken by a term which is also found as a synonym for the Kingdom in the Synoptic Gospels—namely, life or eternal life. But its significance in the two cases is somewhat different. In the Synoptic record, eternal life means simply life in the future New Age or æon of the Kingdom of God; and the Aramaic word which probably underlies it is one which emphasises its temporal duration.[1] But in the Fourth Gospel eternal life is not so much a period of time as a state of being. Remains of the former meaning survive, it is true, in some passages, where the term is used in the eschatological context so common in the Synoptic Gospels.[2] But usually life or eternal life expresses the distinctive quality of the Christian life, as it has been found to be by experience. It is a new condition of existence, an unique activity of spirit, a changed proportion and interplay of powers. It is won by belief in

[1] See an article by Prof. Burkitt in the *Zeitschrift f. d. neutest. Wissenschaft*, 1911.

[2] I reckon that these are about seven out of the thirty-four instances of the term in the Fourth Gospel.

Christ, the Son of God: 'He that believeth on the Son hath eternal life.' He teaches it; He dispenses it; He gives the Water of Life; He is the Bread of Life; nay, He is the Life itself. Whatever we may think of the accuracy of the Johannine record, this at least is clear—that the Church at the end of the first century knew itself to have, through its faith in Christ, the possession of a new and divine life. It could be entered only by the re-birth of baptism and the receiving of the Spirit; and it was nourished in the partaking of the eucharistic bread and wine. And seeing that in it the Church experienced all the spiritual enlightenment and power which prophecy and the best of later Jewish thought had associated with the fulfilment of Messianic hopes, we may well say that in a very real sense the Kingdom of God had come.

And always the sole Source and Giver of the new life is Christ. St. Paul had voiced the intimacy which bound Christians to their Lord in his doctrine of the Church as the Body of Christ. This term is not found in St. John. But others no less intimate are there. Jesus is the Good Shepherd, who knows His sheep and is known by them; He is the Vine, and His disciples are the branches; He calls them, not servants, but friends; for St. John, as for St. Paul, He is in them, and they in Him. But when it comes to the interpretation of Christ's Person, we have in the Fourth Gospel something larger and more thorough than in St. Paul. The starting-point is the same, and the lines of development that go from it are the same; but by St. John they are carried further, and given a more ample scope. He is 'the Light of the World'; so that all the darkness that hangs about the affairs of human life—its purpose, its meaning, its

destiny—is cleared up by Him. He is 'the Resurrection and the Life,' so that to believe in Him is to be already the other side of death. He is 'the only-begotten Son' of God, into whose hand all things have been delivered; so that to have seen Him is to have seen the Father. But for Him we should not have known the Father. The Jews thought that for a man to call God his Father was to make himself equal with God. And so it were, if God had not called men into the fellowship of His Son. But in Him they have the right. For He came from above, from the Father. 'No man hath ascended into heaven, but he that descended out of heaven, even the Son of Man, which is in heaven.' In the bosom of the Father is His home: before Abraham was, He is.

Thus in the Johannine writings we have the climax of the doctrine of Christ's Person. It is no alteration of, or addition to, what we have from His own lips in the Synoptic Gospels: it is rather the translation of that into other terms of thought. There we saw attested by Himself the consciousness of an unique relation to the Father, a Sonship unshared as yet by others; and the knowledge that He was that Son of Man, whom Daniel seemed to prefigure, and of whom the Book of Enoch had spoken as pre-existent from the beginning. St. John thought and wrote in categories more cosmopolitan and general. But the Logos of Græco-Jewish thought is not more transcendent than the Son of Man, which Jesus took for a title; and whatever doubts existed in His lifetime as to the superhuman implicates of the title, they could not survive for those who were now experiencing in Him the power of the Living God.

3. Finally, we come to the third element of early Christian thought—its outlook on the future. We have

noted more than once during this chapter that this element could never be left far out of sight. The Judgment of which Christ gave warning came when He died on the Cross and rose again—yet not so that it was finally consummated. The Kingdom which He promised was inaugurated at Pentecost for those who believed on Him —yet not so that faith made hope unnecessary. And now we are to try and trace the story of this looking forward, and to give it its place in the Christian scheme.

It is clear from the early chapters of the Acts that the expectation of the speedy appearance of the Lord from Heaven was the driving motive of the primitive community of believers. The burden of the first preaching is that the people should believe in Jesus and repent. By His Resurrection it had been proved that He was Messiah, and it was an awful thing to be found Messiah's enemy in the Judgment. Let them therefore save themselves from this crooked generation, and be baptized. St. Peter even seems to say that their repentance will have an effect beyond themselves, in hastening the moment when God will send back Jesus to judge. And the same thought of the impending Advent dominates the Epistles of St. Paul to the Thessalonians, which are chronologically his first. Evidently it had formed a crucial element in the Apostle's instruction to them on his first visit; because he deals directly with certain practical questions which this eschatological belief had aroused in them. It is almost true to say that the only *doctrine* to be found in these epistles is concerned with the Last Things, which are believed to be close at hand.

We have already pointed out that in the process of St. Paul's thought the emphasis gradually shifts from

the future to the present or past. Yet the change is very gradual. If we take the central group of his epistles—as to whose authenticity there is little dispute—we find that in the Epistle to the Romans the thought of the imminent end still plays an important part. We may note, for instance, that the whole controversy about Jewish privilege is opened in an atmosphere of hope and fear—hope for believers, fear for unbelievers. It is the impending Judgment which makes it so vital to settle what are the conditions which belong to acceptance of the Gospel. Is it enough to be a Jew, and to observe the law scrupulously? Must Gentiles be circumcised? These questions would not be so urgent, if it were not felt that the time in which they could be settled was so short, and that their decision affected the eternal destiny of men. Or again, when in the eighth chapter St. Paul sums up the discussion, it is in terms of future expectation. 'There is therefore now no condemnation to them that are in Christ Jesus.' True, this means the mortification of the deeds of the body, the breaking of many old habits, a new and spiritual life—and all this involves suffering. But the suffering is nothing compared to the glorious future which is shortly to begin—a future for which even the whole creation groans in pangs of travail.

Yet in this group of epistles the great doctrines of St. Paul are already beginning to emerge—the Atonement effected by Christ's death, the union of the believer with Him, the work of the Spirit. The apostle could not for long canvass the problems which beset the Church as the body of expectants, without being more and more absorbed in all that the Church experienced and possessed. The thought of Judgment is still pervasive: it appears

here when he speaks of the Eucharist,[1] there when he wishes to enforce some point of Christian morals,[2] again when he wants to encourage and cheer.[3] But it is eclipsed by the other crowding thoughts of the gifts and energies of the Spirit, and of Christ's transforming energies, which he sees around him in the Church.

And then in the Epistles of the Captivity and in the later literature of the New Testament we come to what we may call the maturer eschatology of the Church. It wears in the main three forms. First, there is the line of thought represented by the phrase: 'The Lord is at hand,'[4] and worked out to the full in the Book of Revelation. This has to us to-day a twofold significance. On the one hand, the note of immediacy drives home the duty of moral earnestness: it is when the steward says, 'My Lord delayeth' that he begins to beat the servants. We are to live as though each moment we might be asked to give account. On the other hand, there is expressed the other-worldliness of Christianity, with its corollary of the transience of all mortal things. This note naturally sounds loudest in a time of trial and persecution, when the evidences of God's power seem obscured. But it belongs to all ages too. None ever proclaimed earth's vanity more plainly than Dante; but he wrote in a day of the Church's outward prosperity. To those who are most alive to moral issues the thought of the Heavenly City has always been peculiarly dear. And it emphasises further the truth that in the last resort all rests with God. From Him we came, and to Him we return. On our journey we construct lofty

[1] 1 Cor. xi. 23-32. [2] 1 Cor. vi. 2. [3] Romans xvi. 20.

[4] Phil. iv. 5. Cf. 1 Cor. xvi. 22; Heb. x. 25; James v. 8. Also cf. Phil. i. 6, 10, ii. 16 (the day of Christ); 1 Peter i. 7, 13, iv. 13 (the revelation of Jesus Christ).

ideals, and approximate to them more or less, till they recede; but He is a goal which moves not, and His Heaven a home established above all the storms of change.

Secondly, there is the group of ideas connected with personal immortality. It is this which seems to be meant in the discourse of the Fourth Gospel: 'Ye therefore now have sorrow: but I will see you again, and your heart shall rejoice, and your joy no one taketh from you'; or again, when the Lord speaks of raising the believer 'at the last day.' This at least is sufficient meaning for us. There are some who like to search the eschatological passages and sayings of the New Testament for detailed account of all the circumstances that will befall us in the future. But the task is profitless, since consistency cannot be found. Rather they all attest the sovereign consciousness of the Church that the faith which binds us to Christ is one which is master of death, and that the soul which seems to die passes really into fuller life; and with that certainty vouchsafed by revelation, we are left for the rest to the guidance of the collective reason of the Church.

Thirdly, we have the great vision of the rising Church which is the argument of St. Paul's Epistle to the Ephesians. This epistle is the obverse of the Book of Revelation: while the latter stresses the downward act of God upon the world in the descent of the heavenly Jerusalem at the last, the former looks along the vista of future ages and sees the temple of God being built and compacted, until all things shall have been summed up in Christ. In the Book of Revelation it was Hope that spoke: here it is Faith. To us who are watching the steady extension of the Church throughout the world,

and are imbued with the conception of continuity and progress, it is this which will make most appeal. We may not say that the eschatological element has wholly gone: the 'inheritance' is still the object of future hope; there are yet the trials of the last conflict to be undergone. But the stress falls throughout upon the continuity of the future with the present and the past. If there is no thought here any more than elsewhere in the Bible of the Kingdom of Heaven as the term of a natural evolution, it is not because it is not the term of a process, but because the process to which it belongs is supernatural.

The Church, then, is made of the stuff of two worlds or orders of being: or, as St. Augustine wrote at the beginning of *The City of God*, it is 'partly seated in the course of these declining times, wherein "he that liveth by faith" is a pilgrim amongst the wicked; and partly in that solid estate of eternity, which as yet the other part doth patiently expect, until "righteousness be turned into judgment."' It is no accident that this twofold outlook of Christendom—and indeed that threefold outlook which we have been discussing, upon the past, the present, and the future—is symbolised in the Church's central act of worship. At the institution, the Lord broke the Bread in token of His death, and gave them to eat in token of His gift to them of life, and pointed forward to another meeting with them soon. So St. Paul, when he writes of the Eucharist, looks back to 'the night He died,' speaks of the partaking as 'a communion of the body of Christ,' and says that in this service we 'proclaim the Lord's death, till He come.' And in our own Liturgy the threefold aspect is there. In the Prayer of Consecration, we remind ourselves of the Cross and the Last

Supper; at the Communion, we 'receive the body and blood of Christ,' which are life eternal; after the Communion we pass to the Lord's Prayer, a symbol that all is not yet consummated and the Kingdom not yet come. In short, we have to say that because Christ died the Judgment is past, and because He lives amongst us the Kingdom is already here; and yet also that, because sin and wrong continue to thrive, the Lord's appearing is to be awaited, the Kingdom still to come.

CHAPTER VII

PRINCIPLES OF RELIGIOUS DEVELOPMENT

It is one of the surest guarantees of the permanence of Christianity as an institutional religion that it was born in conflict with a rival Church. For in the attitude which Christ found Himself constrained to adopt towards the Church of His people, Christianity has a classical standard of religious criticism to carry with it. It moves along with the sword of Christ pointed against its own breast; and it needs only a prophet's hand at any necessary moment to drive the sword home. An attempt will be made in this chapter to elucidate the principles which seem to govern Christ's attitude towards the contemporary Jewish Church. No point in His teaching has been more fruitful of misunderstanding. On the one hand, a large school of Protestant and Puritan theology maintains that our Lord's mission was in effect to substitute 'spiritual' for institutional religion, and to liberate the energies of the soul from all trammels of outward form or ritual; and they read His dealings with the Jewish Law and Church in this sense. On the other side, there are many—particularly Jewish scholars, and others not professional scholars at all, but impartial readers of the Gospels—who are shocked by the vehemence of His denunciations of the scribes and Pharisees, and feel that they argue an element of rancour and

extravagance in His character. Both these points of view need to be considered; after which an attempt will be made to estimate the lines of religious development, if any, which form part of the legacy of the historical Jesus to His Church.

Deeds are surer evidence than words: and our Lord's actions forbid the view that He was indifferent to the externals of religion. He used to go Himself to Jerusalem for the observance of the feasts—a fact not only attested by the Fourth Gospel,[1] but also implied in more than one Synoptic passage.[2] He was in the habit of attending the synagogue on the Sabbath, and indeed its services gave Him good opportunity for preaching.[3] On the two occasions where we are told that He cleansed lepers, He charged them to go and report themselves to the priests, in accordance with the Levitical law.[4] This last instance indeed is very significant. Leprosy was a disease which made its victims outcasts from society, and it is as representatives of society, no less than as religious officials, that the priests had the duty of receiving back lepers who were cured. This was what we should now call an essentially conservative arrangement; but Christ acquiesced in it without demur. And, finally, the passion with which He drove the money-changers out of the temple is that of one to whom the sacredness of things and places is a living reality.

When we pass from our Lord's actions in this matter, which are all of a piece, to His words, we are confronted by some of the most complex problems which the Gospels present. There are passages in which He affirms the

[1] John ii. 13, v. 1, vii. 10, and cf. xi. 56. [2] Luke xiii. 7, 34.
[3] Mark i. 21, 22, 39; Luke iv. 16-28; Matt. ix. 35, xiii. 54.
[4] Mark i. 44; Luke xvii. 14.

abiding validity of the Law with a trenchancy which seems past misunderstanding. 'Verily I say unto you, Till heaven and earth pass, one jot or one tittle shall in no wise pass from the law, till all be fulfilled.'[1] Yet when it comes to specific occasions, we find Him limiting the application of particular enactments, reinterpreting them, even consciously improving upon them. Such, for instance, is the case with the payment of the temple tax, with His attitude towards the Sabbath, or to the Mosaic law of divorce. Here He seems to be voicing a principle different from that quoted above, and one which finds expression in the saying, 'No man putteth new wine into old bottles: else the new wine doth burst the bottles, and the wine is spilled, and the bottles will be marred: but new wine must be put into new bottles.'[2] How can these two positions be reconciled?

First, we may say that our Lord's pronouncement on the binding character of the Law represents almost unquestionably the general attitude towards the religious institutions of His time and people. It is the verbal counterpart of His essentially conservative practice in this regard. He came not to destroy the Law, but to fulfil it. It was only by bitter experience and through the contentiousness of Jewish opponents that He came to realise how wide a breach with the past—nothing less indeed than the destruction of the temple—this fulfilment must involve. His whole mind and purpose were towards the recall of Judaism to its true self, to its real line of development. The various problems that arose between Himself and Judaism were all forced on Him from without: and it is only as the flashes of in-

[1] Matt. v. 18; cf. Luke xvi. 17.
[2] Mark ii. 22.

tuition, which this or that encounter with the authorities evoked, light up the scene, that we see the growing divergence of the two roads which the two religions must hereafter tread. As it was, Christ did not Himself seal that divergence: it was left for St. Paul to work out all its consequences.

One of the most illuminative evidences of our Lord's conservative method is the justification which He puts forward for His treatment of the Sabbath. He is not content with stating the spiritual principle behind the ordinances of the Sabbath; but He is careful to reinforce it by appeal to precedent. 'Have ye not read what David did,' He says, 'when he was an hungred and they that were with him?'[1] That is to say, He calls in the exceptions permitted in past tradition to redress the rigour of the present rule. Much is to be learnt in all ages from His use of tradition. It reminds us that, if we criticise a religious tradition, we should do justice to the whole of it and not look only at its contemporary form. Biologists warn us that heredity will throw little light on the characteristics of any person, if only his parents or grandparents be studied; for each of us inherits from an infinite series of ancestors, and the characteristics of any one of them may suddenly assert itself in any given individual of to-day. It is the same with religious tradition. Factors which were to the fore in days long past may have sunk from sight for centuries; but if they were integral to the stream of tradition in the first instance, they are still part of what is carried down the ages, and are then to emerge when they are needed.

[1] A curious parallel to this seems to have occurred during the war at the village of Gerbéviller in the Vosges, where Sœur Julie communicated herself from the Reserved Sacrament, to save it from sacrilege.

It is on lines such as these that we may think of the continuity of Christianity with Judaism. Something has been said in an earlier chapter of our Lord's reinterpretation of the ethical side of Jewish tradition: it remains to speak of the way in which He reinterpreted its institutional side. There are two principles which He asserts very clearly as necessary to the health of religious institutions. The first is freedom. The Jewish hierarchy had made bondsmen of the people: 'Ye lade men with burdens grievous to be borne.' The story of the temple tax contains an implicit criticism on the relation of the people to their Church. The Church which exacts a compulsory toll from its members is not treating them like children. And it follows that if the true spirit were there, the institution would subsist without recourse to compulsion. Far-reaching consequences flow from such a principle. Applied to cases strictly *in pari materia*, it would invalidate any such system as that of the old Church rate in England, and perhaps that of tithe in its original form. But it surely covers much more. One of the points wherein the Church of Rome differs most markedly from the Church of England is that of compulsion in regard to the Sacrament of Penance; and in this and like matters our Lord's principle seems plainly to endorse the Anglican position.

Secondly, for our Lord the law of kindness is supreme over all the external observances of religion. 'The Sabbath was made for man, not man for the Sabbath.' Where there is real human need, as in the case of hunger or sickness, forms may go by the board. This does not mean that they are unimportant, but that they are subservient to human ends. When they conflict with human ends they must give way. A man has no right, for

instance, to refuse obvious claims upon him, on the score of fulfilling a religious duty.[1] Or rather, of two religious duties, the human—it seems bold to say it—takes precedence of the divine. Up to a point the Jews themselves admitted this. That is what gives the sting to the *argumentum ad hominem*, with which our Lord clinches His right to heal on the Sabbath. 'Doth not each one of you,' He says, 'on the Sabbath loose his ox or his ass from the stall, and lead him away to watering?' The principle, then, was inherent in the Jewish custom; what was new and consequently distasteful was its application.

It is because our Lord accords such value to the institutional side of religion, and has such high ideals for it, that He is so unsparing in His criticism of its abuse. *Corruptio optimi pessima.* Christ's quarrel was not with formal religion as such, but with the Jewish leaders who had distorted and misinterpreted it into being formalistic; and the cleavage between Him and them became thus an ultimate one between good and evil, between light and darkness. It was because the scribes and Pharisees were the mainstay of a system which had gone wrong, and gone irreparably wrong, that He launched against them the terrible invective: 'Ye serpents, ye offspring of vipers, how shall ye escape the judgment of hell?' Blind to the dictates of a humanity which their own law and prophets inculcated, their minds were *inverted*—turned, that is, not outwardly towards God and man, but inwardly, along a deadly spiral, towards the end of a process that was always becoming more mechanical. Into this system they were forcing the free spirit of their fellow-Jews, and casting contemptuously aside

[1] Mark vii. 11.

any who could not or would not live up to it. It is no personal bitterness or rancour which prompts these awful denunciations: it is jealousy for God, that His nature should not be so grievously belied. What Jesus was here dealing with is, in short, the constant and characteristic danger of ecclesiasticism: and at nearly every period of Christian history His invective has been in a greater or less degree applicable to the Church. 'If . . . the light that is in thee be darkness, how great is that darkness.' Can condemnation ever be too outspoken, when Falsehood sits upon the throne of Truth? That at least is our answer to the Jewish scholars who regard our Lord's language to the Jewish leaders of His day as a moral defect: we do not feel that His language is one whit too strong when launched, *mutatis mutandis*, against the abuses of ecclesiasticism which we admit to have been only too common in the history of the Church.

We may distinguish three particular vices of ecclesiasticism which Jesus singles out for attack. The first is the spirit of respectability. This spirit begins in religion: 'all their works they do for to be seen of men: they make broad their phylacteries, and enlarge the borders of their garments'; but it loses no time in invading social life; they 'love the uppermost rooms at feasts, and the chief seats in the synagogues, and greetings in the markets, and to be called of men, Rabbi, Rabbi.' The claim to privilege before God quickly passes to the claim to privilege in social life, with the consequent oppression of the weak. It is often said that Christ's teaching is democratic. If political democracy is meant, the statement is wide of the mark, for that was not on the horizon of vision in the days of Jesus.

But if it means the banishment of any claims to exclusive privilege by a particular class, whether in religion or in social life, then the observation is true. 'Be not ye called Rabbi: for one is your Master, even Christ; and all ye are brethren.'

Secondly, Christ exorcised the spirit of taboo. This spirit is twin sister to the last; where that claims privilege for persons of a special status, this claims it for particular things. The world of God's creation is thus parted into the clean and the unclean, the religious and the secular. Among primitive peoples the laws of taboo are necessary on grounds of public health; and where the sole sanction which is recognised is the religious one, these safeguards are bound to be a part of religion. Even to-day in India, for example, the cow is protected by a taboo; and modern observers justify the custom, owing to the vital necessity in that country of preserving that animal for purposes of traction. But it is a different thing when customs are upheld as obligatory, after they have outlived their purpose. 'There is nothing from without a man, that entering into him can defile him: but the things which come out of him, those are they which defile him.' It is true that the full bearing of this assertion was not clear to those who heard it; the first of the disciples had to have yet another lesson before he understood it;[1] but it stands in the Gospels as an original delivery of the mind of Christ, of infinite import for the evolution of religion. To-day, roughly speaking, men either feel themselves bound by the old rules of Catholic discipline, which have come down from the Middle Ages, when their *rationale* was obvious; or they dispense with discipline in religion altogether.

[1] Acts x. 15, 28.

There is no reason to think that the latter class of men object to discipline as such; but they require that what rules there are should commend themselves to the practical reason of our own time; and the Church will only accomplish this reinterpretation in so far as the spirit of taboo is mortified.

And, thirdly, Christ rebuked ritualism. For ritual he has no reproach whatever; but the spirit which exalts ritual or any outward ordinances to a position of predominance among religious interests, and gives them value as an end, not a means, earns His most trenchant condemnation. 'Woe unto you, scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites! for ye pay tithe of mint and anise and cummin, and have omitted the weightier matters of the law, judgment, mercy, and faith.' And yet notice the perfect balance of the conclusion: 'these ought ye to have done, and not to leave the other undone.' The danger is that punctiliousness about ritual may only cloke slackness about religion. From being a legitimate interest, it becomes an absorbing one; until the spiritual life is starved. This, I suggest, is the line of thought in a passage of St. Luke which is generally admitted to be mistranslated in our Authorised Version: 'Now do ye Pharisees make clean the outside of the cup and the platter; but your inward part is full of ravening and wickedness. Ye fools, did not he that made that which is without make that which is within also? But rather let it be of your inward part that you give alms; and, behold, all things are clean unto you.' [1] The last verse is commonly taken in one of two ways: either as 'give alms of such things as ye have,' or 'give as alms what is within the cup and the platter.' But neither does

[1] Luke xi. 39-41.

justice to the order of words in the Greek, and the context seems to require a thought more germane. The contrast is not between ritualism and almsgiving; but between almsgiving which is done for form's sake, and argues no charity behind it, and almsgiving which springs from, or rather consists in, the overflowing kindness of the heart and mind.

. . . . . .

The preceding survey bears very closely on what is perhaps the most outstanding problem occupying the Church at the present day. I mean the question of the nature and place of authority in religion. Up to a few years ago a popular antithesis distinguished between the religion of authority and the religion of the spirit. The first-named was credited to the account of all those who adhered to the traditional beliefs and practices of the historical Church—High Churchmen, Ultramontanes, Orthodox and the like. Crouching like Plato's philosopher beneath the wall, they were supposed to have fled to the Church for shelter from the fiery darts of an enemy more learned, more spiritual, and more progressive than themselves: and their faith consisted in believing what the proper authorities—Pope or bishops or priests—ordained. Hence it was of the static and immoveable kind; and in an evolutionary age like our own, it could only be regarded as a doomed relic of mediæval days. On the other side was set the self-styled religion of the Spirit—the religion of men who were not afraid to discard the trammels of the past, and to set out unimpeded in the quest of new truth, following wheresoever the Spirit might lead them. To such Christians external forms were but the swaddling-clothes

of humanity, which education and progress have enabled it to outgrow; and in doing so it has re-discovered the true Christ, seeing that He was the first to proclaim a spiritual and formless faith. True, no sooner had the period of His direct personal influence passed than Christianity sank to the level of other religions, submerged beneath a sea of forms and formulæ, of ceremonies and ordinances, which were not its native element; until at last its salvage was effected in the nineteenth century by the work of expert theologians and of Protestant thinkers.

But the nineteenth century is not the twentieth; and as the one passed into the other there arose on the horizon of theological vision a cloud no larger than a man's hand; and as it drew nearer, it was seen to be pregnant with conceptions not provided for in the current dichotomy of religion. Tyrrell sounded the death-knell of Auguste Sabatier. For he, and the group of Modernist thinkers whom he represented to this country, came forward with adumbrations of a new doctrine of authority which at once did justice to the claims of tradition, and made openings for future progress. Studying Christian institutions genetically, they found that this doctrine of a pure and formless Christianity, which Christ had preached and Christians had corrupted, was no more than a fable; and basing a new idea of authority on the vital continuity of modern Catholic Christianity with that of the Middle Ages, of the Mediæval Church with the Apostolic Church, and of Apostolic institutions with Judaism, they claimed that they were not only being true to the principles of the historical Jesus, but were also giving to Christian theology—as the 'Liberals' had never done—an orientation which was thoroughly in

harmony with the methods of modern science. If the gist of the foregoing chapter stands, it substantiates the first of these claims. As to the second, we can only speak in outline here.[1] Modernists lay stress on the regulative part which tradition plays in the development of scientific knowledge. None can hope to research to any profit into the ways of nature unless he has first been through the mill of learning, and appropriated the great store of principles and assured conclusions which are now at every man's disposal. In any laboratory they form the condition precedent to all licenses to originality. No one could hope to achieve progress in science who began by repudiating the principle of the uniformity of nature, or adhering to the pre-Copernican astronomy. There are certain truths about nature which must be taken for granted at the start. And that is to bring in the element of authority. True, it is not authority as it used to be conceived; it does not operate *ab extra*, but is always open to verification by any one who cares to try. And this is just what is claimed for Catholic tradition. That, too, challenges verification. It creates certain probabilities of experience for the human spirit, and invites it to put them to the proof. It is true that verification here must be a much slower matter, owing to the infinitely greater delicacy of the subject-matter, and the difficulty of expressing all spiritual experience. But the function of authority in the two processes is the same—regulative, rather than imperative, fertilising, not cramping, the energies of the mind, and

[1] The view which I try to outline here is more fully elaborated in article in *Comment and Criticism* (May 1914), entitled 'The Creeds and Current Controversies,' by Mr. W. Spens, Fellow and Tutor of Corpus Christi College, Cambridge.

shaping it towards the further control of life and nature.

'God is a Spirit: and they that worship Him must worship Him in spirit and in truth.' But the way to compass this is not through the rejection of the old ways, not through breaking with the main stream of tradition. 'Ye worship ye know not what,' Christ said to the woman of Samaria. 'We know what we worship.' And it was of the Jews, not of the Samaritans, that salvation came.

NOTES AND ILLUSTRATIONS

**** The letters attached to the number of the page in the subjoined list indicate that the notes or references illustrate matter in the first, second, or third paragraph on the page respectively. References which belong to the same clause or sentence in the text of the book are separated by a semicolon. Those belonging to different sentences are separated by a full stop.*

CHAPTER I

P. 14. *a.* Matt. ii. 8.

„ 15. *a.* Mark viii. 38; ix. 1. For the critical questions connected with these verses, see Chapter v. Another cogent example is Matt. vii. 21, 22.

„ 19. *a.* Matt. xviii. 7. Luke x. 18, cf. John xii. 31. Luke xii. 50, cf. John xiv. 30. Matt. vi. 34.

b. Luke xxii. 31.

„ 20. *a.* Matt. xiii. 19, cf. vv. 25, 38. Matt. vii. 11, cf. vi. 13. Mark x. 18. Ps. xxii. 3 especially.

„ 21. *a.* Luke xvii. 7-10, and cf. the Parables in which man is compared to a servant—The Unmerciful Servant (Matt. xviii. 23 f.); The Labourers in the Vineyard (Matt. xx. 1 f.); or to a Steward (Luke xii. 42 f.; xvi. 1 f.; and Matt. vii. 21). Luke xviii. 14, and the Parable of the Prodigal Son (Luke xv. 11-32). Matt. v. 45, cf. Eph. v. 1, Phil. ii. 15. Matt. v. 48.

„ 22. *a.* John viii. 3-11.

„ 27. *a.* Luke v. 34. Mark iv. 3-8, 14-20; Matt. xiii. 3-8, 18-23; Luke viii. 5-8, 11-15. Mark iv. 30-2; Matt. xiii. 31, 32; Luke xiii. 18, 19. Matt. xiii. 33; Luke xiii. 20, 21. Mark iv. 26-9.

b. Matt. xiii. 36-43. Matt. xiii. 47-50.

„ 28. *a.* 'One great commentator,' viz. Wellhausen. Matt.

xi. 12 (Luke xvi. 16). Matt. xxi. 31. Matt. xxiii. 13, cf. Luke xi. 52. The same interpretation covers Matt. xxi. 43: the Kingdom could be taken away from the Jewish Church, not because they already possessed it, but because they possessed the promise of it; just as a person may be said to be deprived of property, if the clause in the will which leaves it to him is deleted by the testator.

CHAPTER II

P. 36. *b*. Luke xix. 11. Mark xiii. 34.

„ 37. *c*. Matt. xxiv. 27. Luke xxi. 34. Matt. xxiv. 43. Luke xii. 36.

„ 38. *b*. Mark viii. 11, 12; Matt. xvi. 1; Luke xi. 16.

„ 39. *a*. 'Jonah.' Matt. xii. 39, 40; Luke xi. 29, cf. Mark viii. 11, 12. Loisy apparently thinks that we have here two accounts, in Mark and in Q respectively, of the same occasion, and that Mark gives the authentic record; the allusion to Jonah in Q being due to the genuine saying in Matt. xii. 41 = Luke xi. 32. This is surely to carry the principle of economy too far. Is it not far more likely that the first use of Jonah as an example suggested to our Lord the second?

„ 42. *b*. Matt. v. 18; Luke xvi. 17; Mark xiii. 31. Rev. xxi. 1; Acts iii. 21; 2 Peter iii. 13; 1 Cor. vii. 31, cf. 1 John ii. 17.

„ 46. Mark xii. 9. Matt. xii. 41, 42, cf. Matt. x. 15; xi. 20-24; viii. 12; Luke xi. 50.

„ 47. *a*. Luke xvii. 34.

CHAPTER III

„ 53. Mark iv. 2-9. Matt. ix. 37, 38; xiii. 24-30. Mark iii. 14. Matt. ix. 36, cf. Ez. xxxiv. 5. Matt. xi. 15; xiii. 9; Luke xiv. 35. Mark x. 40.

„ 54. *a*. Luke xiii. 6-9, 34, 35; xiv. 15-24. Luke xviii. 8.

„ 55. *b*. 'Their own Scriptures,' *e.g.* Is. liii., Wisdom ii. 13-15.

„ 57. *b*. Mark i. 14, 15. Matt. v. 1.

P. 59. *c.* Ex. iv. 22; Jer. xxxi. 9, cf. Hos. xi. 1; Tobit xiii. 4; Deut. xxxii. 6; Is. lxiii. 16.

'One rabbi,' *Pirqe Aboth*, v. 30 (Taylor's *Sayings of the Jewish Fathers*): the date of this is before 200 A.D., but it gives the Jewish point of view of earlier days.

„ 61. *b.* Matt. v. 45. Matt. xxv. 34.

„ 62. Luke xv. 20-4.

„ 63. *b.* Matt. xviii. 21-35.

„ 64. *b.* John x. 10. Luke xix. 12-27. The Parable of the Talents in Matt. xxv. 14 ff. is probably another version of this, see Montefiore, *The Synoptic Gospels*, ii. 748 ff. The introduction of the eschatological colouring is characteristically Matthæan. Trench treats the two parables as distinct, and succeeds in giving great value to the peculiarities of each. In the Lucan parable, vv. 14, 27 are probably later additions. Matt. vii. 19, 15-23. Luke xiii. 6-9.

„ 66. *a.* Matt. xii. 27; xi. 23. John ii. 23; v. 26; xiv. 10.

„ 67. *a.* Luke vii. 37-50. Mark v. 34. Matt. viii. 10. Mark v. 36. Matt. xiii. 58.

b. Mark xi. 21-3 (the same implication lies in the reproach of Mark ix. 19). Mark ix. 42 (the words 'on me' are possibly not original; but they are certainly implied). Mark ii. 1-12.

„ 69. *a.* 'Satanic origin,' Luke xiii. 16.

„ 72. *b.* Luke xviii. 2-7.

„ 73. Matt. vi. 9-15; Luke xi. 2-4. Lev. xxii. 32; Is. xxix. 23; Ez. xxxvi. 23; Zech. xiv. 9. I take these references from the late Dr. Taylor's *Sayings of the Jewish Fathers*, Excursus v., where there is a very scholarly commentary on the Lord's Prayer. See, too, his Additional Notes, pp. 176-92.

„ 73. 'Thy will be done.' This petition is omitted by Luke, and thus was probably not in Q; so too the clause, 'deliver us from the evil.'

'Corruption of the heart.' I adopt the interpreta-

tion of 'the evil' given by Dr. Taylor in his Additional Notes mentioned above.

P. 74. *b.* Luke xi. 5-8. Luke xi. 9. Mark xi. 24.
c. Matt. xviii. 19. Mark xi. 25.
„ 76. *b.* Luke xviii. 9-14.

CHAPTER IV

„ 77. *a.* Luke xix. 10. Mark ii. 17. Luke xv. 7.
„ 78. *b.* John iii. 3, 5.
„ 83. *b.* Mark xiii. 37. Mark xiii. 34-6.
„ 85. *b.* Matt. xiii. 45, 46. Matt. xiii. 44. Luke xvi. 13. Luke xiv. 26. Matt. xvi. 25.
„ 86. Matt. xix. 12. Luke xviii. 22.
„ 87. *a.* 'Discipline of character.' For the danger of obscuring the claims of the spirit in secular activities, cf. the Parable of the Great Supper, Luke xiv. 15-24, especially vv. 18-20.
'Sanction in Christ's teaching.' Matt. vi. 16-18; perhaps Luke v. 35.
„ 88. *b.* Mark x. 29, 30. Mark viii. 35; x. 29, cf. Matt. v. 11.
„ 89. *b.* Mark xii. 28-34, cited from Deut. vi. 4, 5.
„ 90. Luke xii. 13, 14.
„ 92. *b.* Mark x. 21.
„ 104. *b.* Deut. vi. 13; Lev. xix. 12.
„ 108. *b.* Matt. xix. 10-12. 1 Cor. vii.
„ 111. *b.* Matt. xiii. 24-30. Matt. xiii. 47-50.
„ 112. *b.* Acts i. 15; ix. 30; 1 Cor. xv. 6.
„ 113. *a.* Acts i.; ii. Acts xii. 17; xv. 13 f.; xxi. 18 f.
b. Gal. ii. 11; Acts xi. 2 f., where the actual charge is of 'eating with' Gentiles; but more doubtless lies behind.
„ 114. *a.* Acts i. 21-6. Acts viii. 14 f. Matt. xix. 28. Gal. vi. 16.
„ 115. *b.* Ez. ix., cf. Psalms of Solomon, xv. 8. Rev. vii. 3, cf. ix. 4; xiii. 16; xiv. 1; xxii. 4; and the white stone, inscribed with the new name, *ibid.* ii. 17, cf. Gal. vi. 17.

P. 116. *b.* John iv. 1. Matt. xxi. 25. John iii. 5. Matt. xxviii. 19.

„ 117. *b.* 'A banquet.' See the evidence in Dr. Taylor's *Pirqe Aboth*, p. 60. Ps. xxiii. 5 was interpreted in this sense; and in one passage from the Talmud (Baba Bathra, 74 *b*) and in Apoc. Bar. xxix. 4, 4 Ezra vi. 49-52, the banquet is upon the female Leviathan; and cf. Prov. ix. 5; Is. xxv. 6; Matt. viii. 11; Luke xiv. 15; Rev. xix. 9; also Rom. xiv. 17.

„ 119. *b.* Matt. xvi. 19; xviii. 18.

„ 120. Acts xv. 28, 29, cf. Acts xxi. 28. John xx. 23. Acts v. 1-11. 1 Cor. v. 5; 2 Cor. ii. 10.

CHAPTER V

„ 127. Matt. xi. 2-6; Luke vii. 19-23.

„ 132. *b.* Mark ix. 37. Mark xii. 35-7.

„ 134. Mark xiii. 32.

„ 135. *b.* Mark iii. 27. Mark ix. 7. Matt. xxii. 2 f.

„ 136. Mark xii. 6, with which cf. also Matt. xxvii. 43, Mark xiv. 61, Luke xxii. 70, for the Messianic use of 'Son of God.'

„ 137. *a.* Mark i. 38; Matt. xi. 5. Mark ii. 18.

CHAPTER VI

„ 191. *a.* John iii. 36; xvii. 3; xx. 31. John vi. 68; x. 10, 28; iv. 14; vi. 35, 48; xi. 25; xiv. 6. John iii. 3, 5; vi. 52-9.

„ 192. *a.* John v. 18; iii. 13.

„ 193. *b.* 2 Peter iii. 12. 1 Thess. iv. 2 Thess. iii. 11.

„ 194. *a.* Rom. i.; ii.; especially ii. 5-11.

INDEX

Printed by T. and A. Constable, Printers to His Majesty
at the Edinburgh University Press

BS
2415
S4

Selwyn, Edward Gordon, 1885-
The teaching of Christ : an attempt to appre-
ciate the main lineaments of the teaching of
Christ in their historical proportion / by Ed-
ward Gordon Selwyn. -- London ; New York : Lon
mans, Green, 1915.
xi, 219p. ; 20cm. -- (The Layman's library)

Includes bibliographical references and inde

1. Jesus Christ-- Teachings. I. Title.

A 27704

CCSC/mmb